

VOLUME XIX

NOVEMBER, 1933

NUMBER 7

# BULLETIN

OF

## THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

ANNUAL MEETING

PHILADELPHIA, DECEMBER 29, 30

ROLLINS COLLEGE REPORT

CENTRE COLLEGE STATEMENT

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE: JOSEPH ALLEN; PAUL KAUFMAN;  
JOSEPH MAYER; H. W. TYLER, *Chairman*.

*Publication Office:* 20TH AND NORTHAMPTON STS., EASTON, PA.

*Editorial Office:* 744 JACKSON PLACE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Issued monthly except in June, July, August, and September.

---

Entered as Second-class matter, April 24, 1922, at the Post Office at  
Easton, Pa., under the Act of August 24, 1912.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,  
Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on September 13, 1918.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

EDITORIAL NOTE.....	402
NOTES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS	
Annual Meeting.....	403
Report of Committee to Nominate Officers.....	403
October Meeting of the Council.....	404
Constitutional Amendments.....	407
Social Science Research Council, Grants in Aid and Research Fellowships.....	410
Comparative Study of Medical and Legal Education.....	410
National Research Council, Historical Articles.....	411
Student Loan Fund Survey.....	411
Pure Food Legislation.....	412
National Anti-Crime Conference.....	413
Representatives.....	414
Members Whose Addresses Are Unknown.....	414
ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE	
Rollins College Report.....	416
Centre College, Committee A Statement.....	440
EDUCATIONAL DISCUSSION	
Report of Committee U on College and University Teach- ing, <i>Lotus D. Coffman</i> .....	441
Some Administrative Requirements Governing the Appoint- ment and Promotion of College Teachers, <i>C. H. Thompson</i>	442
A Program for Tomorrow, <i>Henry Suzzallo</i> .....	444
REVIEWS	
A Call to Teachers.....	446
Measuring Teaching Efficiency among College Instructors	447
LOCAL AND CHAPTER NOTES	
Indiana University, Two-Year Elective Course.....	449
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Student Tutors.....	450
University of Minnesota, Emergency Graduate Fellowships	450
University of Pittsburgh, Resolutions.....	451
COMMUNICATIONS	
From a University President.....	453
From a Junior Member.....	453

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

401

## MEMBERSHIP

Nominations for Membership.....	454
---------------------------------	-----

## APPOINTMENT SERVICE

Vacancy Reported.....	456
Teachers Available.....	456

Contents of previous issues of the *Bulletin* of the American Association of University Professors may be found by consulting the EDUCATION INDEX.

## EDITORIAL NOTE

The report on tenure conditions in Rollins College contained in this issue involves principles of such importance as to justify extended treatment. It will be noted in particular that the administration made strenuous efforts to confine the attention of the committee to a single case while the major concern of the committee as of the Association is with general tenure conditions in the institution. It may be added that members of the Association in the college have formally protested against the publication of any report, a protest which could not be seriously entertained without abandoning the established policy of the Association in informing its membership of the existence of what its Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure considers abnormal conditions.

The importance of the proposed changes in the Constitution and By-Laws will be self-evident. To a large extent, they involve no new principle but rather the clarification and codification of recent experience and existing practice. The proposals from the University of Pittsburgh represent a welcome degree of local interest in the affairs of the Association. One of our most important problems is the adjustment of responsibility and initiative between the central organization and the general membership whether organized in chapters or not.

The brief note on pure food legislation relates to the general rather than the professional interests of members.

The Executive Committee of the Council has recently approved an arrangement under which the Mack Printing Company undertakes the solicitation of advertising for the *Bulletin*. Certain information will be invited from chapters and members as a basis for this effort to improve our financial condition.



## NOTES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

### ANNUAL MEETING

The annual meeting of the Association will be held at the Benjamin Franklin Hotel, Philadelphia, Friday and Saturday, December 29 and 30, in connection with the meetings of the American Economic Association and the American Political Science Association.

Preliminary arrangements have been made for the program as follows:

Friday, 10:00 A. M. The first session will include a report of the Committee on the Economic Condition of the Profession, and reports of the officers, Council, and other committees. Presentation of topics or questions by representatives of chapters. Amendments of Constitution and By-Laws.

Friday, 1:00 P. M. Luncheon, University of Pennsylvania.

Friday, 2:30 P. M. The second session will include a statement by the chairman of the Committee on College and University Teaching in regard to the work of the committee since the presentation of its report at the last annual meeting, followed by discussion of the report. Discussion of the Report of the Committee on Required Courses in Education.

Friday, 7:00 P. M. Annual Dinner. President's Address.

Saturday, 9:30 A. M. Report of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure. Election of officers. Unfinished and miscellaneous business.

Saturday, 1:00 P. M. Luncheon.

Saturday, 2:30 P. M. Council meeting.

### REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOMINATE OFFICERS

#### *President*

S. A. Mitchell, Astronomy, Virginia

#### *Vice-Presidents*

H. W. Tyler, Mathematics, Washington Office

Yandell Henderson, Physiology, Yale

#### *General Secretary*

W. W. Cook, Law, Johns Hopkins

#### *Members of the Council* (term expiring December 31, 1936)

L. L. Bernard, Sociology, Washington (St. Louis)

A. P. Brogan, Philosophy, Texas

Gilbert Chinard, Romance Languages, Johns Hopkins

F. M. Fling, History, Nebraska

J. R. Hayden, Political Science, Michigan

W. T. Laprade, History, Duke

W. A. Oldfather, Latin, Illinois

A. Richards, Zoology, Oklahoma  
U. G. Weatherly, Economics, Indiana  
J. B. Zinn, Chemistry, Gettysburg

Member of the Council to take the place of W. J. Robbins, resigned  
(term expiring December 31, 1934)  
E. S. Allen, Mathematics, Iowa State.

#### OCTOBER MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

A preliminary informal meeting of western members of the Council, with the Committee on Policy, was held at Chicago, October 8, with eight members present, including the President and the General Secretary.

The Committee on Policy voted to recommend continued maintenance of the Appointment Service, with a view to possible expansion whenever conditions improve. The committee voted to recommend certain changes in the Constitution. (See page 407.)

In regard to proposals presented by the Chapter at the University of Pittsburgh, it was the opinion of the committee that the employment of a field representative is not at present practicable, and that the nomination of members of the Council by chapters is impracticable and undesirable if only because many chapters in important institutions are unwilling to accept such responsibility.

It was suggested that a by-law be drafted for the guidance of Nominating Committees, with a view to maintaining well-balanced representation in membership of the Council as to geographical distribution, representation of different types of institutions, and of different fields of professional interest. (See page 408.)

In regard to the desire expressed by certain chapters for reduction of dues, it was the judgment of the committee that such a reduction would not be justified and that it would cripple the activities of the Association without affording material relief to the individual member. It was recommended that a statement be prepared for circulation to the membership in regard to this. (See page 405.)

---

The Council met at the Washington office October 21, with an attendance of sixteen members. Much important business was transacted during an all-day session.

*Financial Condition.* The Treasurer presented the financial statement for the nine months ending September 30, indicating in comparison with 1932 a substantial increase in Committee expense, considerable reductions in Appointment Service and *Bulletin*, the total net savings

being in excess of the falling-off in receipts. The number of unpaid membership dues is about 4000, due in part to bank suspensions; the net loss of membership for 12 months is less than 200.

*Dues.* The following statement presented by the General Secretary in regard to reasons for maintaining the present dues and probable effects of a reduction was approved in substance for circulation to chapters and publication in the *Bulletin*, with the expectation that a briefer note will be inclosed with January bills.

---

Several chapters, some 14 out of 220,<sup>1</sup> have made more or less urgent recommendations that the dues of the Association should be reduced. Members resigning from the Association have been habitually invited to state the reason. In about 2% of the cases, high dues are mentioned. The Council and the officers have given serious attention to these complaints and representations. It is their best judgment, first, that it would be unwise for the Association to lower the dues at a time when the work of the central office and committees is necessarily much increased by current economic conditions; second, that the experience of this year justifies the hope that the loss from resignations will not be excessive; third, that it is, on the whole, better for the Association to incur the risk of some loss of membership rather than to curtail its activities to the extent a reduction of dues would require. Believing that a careful explanation of the situation will prove convincing to the membership, the Council has refrained from publishing in the November *Bulletin* any proposal for an amendment of the Constitution, and no chapter or member has taken the responsibility of doing so.

From 1915 to February, 1929, the work of the Association was carried on as a minor activity by a full-time professor, with a limited amount of clerical service, so that the principal expenses were for printing, clerical service, and committee investigations. At the end of 1916, with a serious deficit, it became necessary to solicit contributions from members, and the dues were in 1919 increased from \$2.00 to \$3.00. The membership of the Association increased from 2244 in 1918 to 6468 in January, 1928. It was no longer possible for the work to be carried on in the limited fashion outlined, and the Council adopted the courageous policy of establishing an office in Washington and taking responsibility for the necessary rental, salaries, and clerical staff. During the preceding years, a substantial surplus had been accumulated with this probable objective in view. Since the establishment of the Washington office in 1929, the membership has increased to approximately 12,000. For two years, from 1928 to 1930, the advance in dues was postponed, probably unwisely, and the Association was living in part on its accumulated surplus.

<sup>1</sup> These chapters include about four per cent of the total membership.

During the depression period, there has been a substantial reduction in certain expenses, notably printing and clerical service. On the other hand, there has been a great increase in the amount of committee work, the number of cases handled by Committee A, for example, increasing from 25 in 1929 to 82 in 1932, which will probably be surpassed the present year. The expense of the Washington office has been reduced, and the possibility of further reduction is now engaging the attention of the Council. The total expense of the Association per member during recent years has been as follows: 1930, \$4.19; 1931, \$3.92; 1932, \$3.46.

The Appointment Service, which is sometimes the object of criticism as a drain on the Association's treasury, has actually involved a net outlay of less than the \$2000 per year originally authorized, but it is very important in this connection to bear in mind that this outlay has been to a large (though indeterminate) extent offset by the accession of junior members, who in due time are transferred to the active list. It would, in the judgment of the Council and the Committees on Policy and on Survey of the Washington office, be most unwise either to reduce the activity of Committee A or to discontinue the Appointment Service at a time when so many of our members are unemployed.

The effect of a reduction of the dues to \$3.00, involving a probable loss of about \$8000 in income, would presumably be along some of or all the following lines:

- (a) reduction of two salaries from \$7000 to \$5000;
- (b) reduction of clerical staff by 20-25 per cent;
- (c) reduction of size of *Bulletin* by about one-third;
- (d) discontinuance of Appointment Service (and Junior Membership);
- (e) curtailment of investigations and other committee activities;
- (f) transfer of office to less eligible location;
- (g) abandonment of subsidized delegate meetings;
- (h) discontinuance of chapter rebate.

The general loss of prestige might well be more serious than any of these individual items.

Dues in certain other more or less comparable organizations are: American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Economic Association, American Historical Association, Modern Language Association, Society for the Promotion of Engineering Education, \$5.00; American Bar Association, \$8.00.

*Pittsburgh Proposals.* On consideration of a communication from the University of Pittsburgh chapter (see page 451) it appeared that the chapter was not concerned merely with a particular method of choosing members of the Council but with the broader question of larger participa-

tion by chapters in the activities of the Association. It was voted after discussion that the President on behalf of the Council invite the chapter to present its views more fully at the Annual Meeting. The matter will also be commended to the attention of the Committee on Chapters.

In connection with this proposal attention may be called to changes in By-Law 1 recommended by the Council (page 408) and to the following memorandum in regard to procedure also approved by the Council:

"The January or February Chapter Letter might well contain the names of the Nominating Committee and an invitation that chapters in their replies to the letter nominate possible or preferred members of the Council, not necessarily from their own chapters. The replies assembled at the Washington office would be transmitted to the Committee on Nominations with the usual other memoranda of past membership and distribution. The committee in making up its slate would find the material thus assembled of considerable value, but would make its selections with due regard to distribution under the proposed by-law. The chapters would have no authoritative voice in the matter. The combination of chapters by groups would be unnecessary, and it would be one of the functions of the committee to call on particular chapter officers who had not replied for new nominations if needed. Any member whether in a chapter or not would have the right to send suggestions to the Nominating Committee and any ten members would retain their present right to present an additional name."

#### CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS<sup>1</sup>

Changes in the Constitution and By-Laws recommended by the Committee on Policy, the Committee on Honorary Membership, and the General Secretary were discussed and approved, subject to editorial revision by a drafting committee, as follows:

##### *Article II—Membership*

Sect. 1. Change "Honorary" to "Emeritus."

Sect. 3. (Line 2)—Insert "or junior" before "membership."

Sect. 4. Eliminate the present wording and substitute the following, "Any active member retiring for age from a position in teaching or research may be transferred, at his own request and with the approval of the Council, to Emeritus Membership."

##### *Article III—Officers*

Sect. 1. The Officers of the Association shall be a President, two Vice-Presidents, a General Secretary, and a Treasurer.

<sup>1</sup> Comparison may be made with the present Constitution in the January *Bulletin*, page 50.



Sect. 2. The officers, together with the three latest living ex-Presidents shall with thirty elective members constitute the Council of the Association, in which the responsible management of the Association and the control of its property shall be vested.

Sect. 3. The term of office of the President, the Vice-Presidents, and the General Secretary shall be two years, that of the elective members of the Council three years, ten elective members retiring annually, but if in any year the term of the President and both Vice-Presidents expire simultaneously, one of the latter may be designated by the Council to serve an additional year. The terms of the officers shall expire at the closing session of the annual meeting, or thereafter on the election of successors.

Sect. 4. The President, the Vice-Presidents, the General Secretary, and the elective members of the Council shall be elected by a majority vote of members present and voting at the annual meeting. The Treasurer shall be elected by the Council. The President, Vice-Presidents, and the retiring elective members of the Council shall not be eligible for immediate re-election to their respective offices. In case of a vacancy in any office, the Council shall have power to fill it until the next annual meeting and such appointees shall be eligible for continuance by election at that time.

Sect. 6. Omit present Section 6.

#### *Article V—The Council*

Sect. 1. Omit Treasurer.

Sect. 2. The Council shall be responsible for carrying out the general purposes of the Association as defined in the Constitution. It shall deal with questions of financial or general policy, with the time, place, and program of the annual and of any special meetings of the Association. It shall present a written report to the Association at the annual meeting. It shall have authority to delegate specific responsibility to an Executive Committee of not less than six members including the President and to appoint other committees to investigate and report on subjects germane to the purposes of the Association. (See By-Law 11)

Sect. 3. Meetings of the Council shall be held in connection with the annual meeting of the Association and at least at one other time during each year. The members present at any meeting duly called shall constitute a quorum. The Council may also transact business by letter ballot.

#### *By-Laws*

1. *Nomination for Office.* At each annual meeting or promptly thereafter, the president shall appoint, by and with the advice and

consent of the Council, a committee of not less than five members, not officers or other members of the Council, to present nominations for the offices to be filled at the next annual meeting. In carrying on its work, the committee shall seek advice from chapters or members of the Association. In selecting nominees for the Council, it shall aim to secure a fair distribution among geographical regions, among various types of institutions, and among fields of professional interest. Nominations shall be reported to the Secretary in time for publication in that issue of the *Bulletin* which is to be mailed to members of the Association not later than one month before the annual meeting. At the annual meeting, the nominations of the committee and any other nominations proposed in writing by ten or more members of the Association shall be voted upon by ballot by members present at the meeting.

7. *General Secretary.* The General Secretary shall carry on the work of the Association and the Council under the general direction of the President, preparing the business for all meetings and keeping the records thereof. He shall conduct correspondence with the Council, Committees, and Chapters of the Association. He shall collect the membership dues and any other sums due the Association and transfer them to the Treasurer. He shall have charge of the office of the Association and be responsible for its efficient and economical management. He shall be a member of the editorial committee of the official periodical. He may with the approval of the President delegate any of these duties to an Executive Secretary or Assistant Secretary appointed by the Council for that purpose.

8. *Treasurer.* The Treasurer shall receive all moneys and deposit the same in the name of the Association. He shall invest any funds not needed for current disbursements, as authorized by the Council. He shall pay all bills when approved as provided in By-Law 10. He shall make a report to the Association at the annual meeting and such other reports as the Council may direct. He may with the approval of the Council authorize an Assistant Treasurer to act in his stead.

9. *Salaries; Sureties.* The General Secretary and the Treasurer shall be paid salaries determined by the Council and shall furnish such sureties as the Council may require.

10. *Payments.* Bills shall be approved for payment by the General Secretary or in his absence by the President or a Vice-President. Every bill of more than \$100 shall require the approval of two of these officers. Any bill not falling within the budget for the year shall require authorization by the Executive Committee.

11. *Executive Committee.* The Executive Committee shall have immediate supervision of the financial management of the Association, employing an auditor annually and making investment of surplus funds,

to be reported to the Council. It shall be responsible for approval of the Budget prepared by the General Secretary and the Treasurer and for such other matters as may be referred to it by the Council. Meetings of the Committee may be held at the call of the President as its chairman.

#### SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL, GRANTS IN AID AND RESEARCH FELLOWSHIPS

The Social Science Research Council offers for 1934 and 1935 grants for work in economics, political science, sociology, anthropology, statistics, psychology, history, and related fields to mature scholars of demonstrated capacity for productive research. The grants aim to provide living expenses in the field, travel, clerical assistance, printing, etc., but may not be used for expense of attending meetings or purchasing materials, books, or apparatus. The amount granted will ordinarily not exceed \$1000. Applications are receivable at the office of the Council, 230 Park Avenue, New York, up to February 1, and grants will be announced April 1.

The research fellowships also offered by the Council are open to men and women, citizens of the United States or Canada, who possess the Ph.D. degree or its equivalent, and who ordinarily are not over thirty-five years of age. The primary purpose of these fellowships is to broaden the research training and equipment of promising young social scientists, not to facilitate the completion of research projects or the continuation of investigations undertaken as doctoral dissertations. The basic stipend for a period of twelve months is \$1800 for single Fellows and \$2500 for married Fellows. The closing date for receipt of applications for 1934-35 is December 1. Awards will be announced March 1.

#### COMPARATIVE STUDY OF MEDICAL AND LEGAL EDUCATION<sup>1</sup>

Medical schools have decreased in the last twenty-five years. Law schools have increased from 102 to 185, of which only 82 are approved. New admissions to law schools in 1932 exceeded medical school admissions by more than 50%, 9340 against about 6200. In 1930, the total attendance in law schools was 46,751 against 21,597 in medical schools, the total number of lawyers in the United States about 175,000, of physicians 155,000, an increase of about 60% for the lawyers and 19% for the physicians in thirty years. In 1932, more than 19,000 persons attempted to pass the bar examinations in the various states. Only 45% passed. It is said that repeated trials by unsuccessful candidates

<sup>1</sup> Condensed from an article in the *Journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges*, vol. viii, No. 5.



have resulted in nine-tenths being finally admitted. Only 19 states require two years of college education or its equivalent for candidates for the bar.

#### NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL, HISTORICAL ARTICLES

A valuable series of articles on the history of the various divisions of the Council during the fifteen years of its existence has been published in recent issues of *Science*. Particular attention may be called to that on the Research Information Service published in the issue of September 8 and containing a considerable amount of bibliographical information.

#### STUDENT LOAN FUND SURVEY

A committee of the American Alumni Council has made a survey (in March, 1933) to ascertain the facts about the loan fund situation among colleges and universities and to present these facts to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the hope that federal aid might be made available. Replies were received from 181 institutions representing every type. The tabulation brought out the following facts:

Ninety-five per cent of the institutions stated that no further retrenchment could be made without seriously impairing the effectiveness of their educational programs.

One hundred and fifty-three schools reported a total reduction in faculty between the years 1930-31 and 1932-33 of 942 members. Assuming that these 152 schools represented a fair cross section of American colleges and universities, it was estimated that 4239 faculty members were released during the period.

Including faculty, administrative, and other workers, the total number of workers released from colleges and universities between the years 1930-31 and 1932-33 would be 8771, or an average of 4385 for each of the two years.

Ninety schools out of 130 reporting, or 69 per cent, stated they would release workers this fall in all departments; this same proportion for the 700 schools would give a figure of 6170 college and university workers to be released. In other words, the number of released workers this fall would be 40 per cent greater than the average for the previous two years.

One hundred and thirty-six out of 700 schools reported reductions in faculty salaries of \$4,673,785 between 1930-31 and 1932-33.

Including faculty, administrative, and other workers, the total salary reduction made in the 700 colleges and universities during 1930-31 and 1932-33 would amount to \$42,000,000.

One hundred and forty-eight schools out of 167 replying to the question, or a total of 88 per cent, stated they would reduce their budgets for the year 1933-34; these reductions will range from 5 per cent to an extreme of 50 per cent; 79 schools will reduce their budgets in 1933-34 by a total of \$5,176,235; an extension of this ratio to 88 per cent of the colleges and universities gives an approximate budget reduction this fall of more than about \$40,000,000. In other words the amount of the budget reduction this fall will be practically twice as large as for the average of the previous two years.

The committee ascertained that the R. F. C. is empowered to make loans only for specific purposes and to certain specified types of financial institutions, that the only possibility of a loan might come through a credit union, a cooperative association organized within a defined homogeneous group in accordance with state laws and under the supervision of some State Department. While the credit union may be of future value in building up loan funds in some colleges and universities, its value to institutions now maintaining alumni funds is less obvious.

The final conclusion of the committee is that, except through the credit union, no loan fund can be expected from the R. F. C. without further Congressional action. The Alumni Council has since satisfied itself that the credit union procedure is too complicated for the colleges and universities to adopt and that a national credit union is not feasible. The Council desires to assist college students to continue their education and aims to cooperate with institutions in any plans that may be undertaken for this purpose.

#### PURE FOOD LEGISLATION

By direction of President Roosevelt weaknesses of the pure food and drug law are to be corrected by a new bill drafted by the Department of Agriculture, which will come up for action early in the next session of Congress.

The new measure brings cosmetics and curative devices—everything from hair dyes to sun lamps and orthopedic shoes—under government control. The present law does not cover even poisonous cosmetics unless their labels bear curative claims for disease, nor does it apply to devices at all.

False advertising of foods, drugs, and cosmetics through any medium is absolutely prohibited. (Except for label claims, advertising has not been subject to the law before.) Labels must not only be truthful, as required at present, but definitely informative, so that the buyer may know exactly what he is getting and how he can use it without harm.

The Federal Government is authorized to set up standards of identity

and quality for all food products, and to establish safe tolerances for poisons in foods. Where food may be injurious because of unsanitary methods of production, the Government can put the manufacturer under a permit that will insure the maintenance of proper safeguards.

Fabulous curative claims can no longer be made for medicinal drugs if this bill is passed. To correct false claims, it will be enough for the Government to show that a drug is worthless for the advertised purpose without having to prove also, as required under the present law, that the manufacturer knows it is.

Exhibits of actual commercial products have been prepared by the Food and Drug Administration to illustrate the limitations of the existing law, as well as articles discussing important features of Professor Tugwell's bill and the abuses it is designed to correct. The articles may be obtained directly from the Food and Drug Administration. Arrangements for showing the exhibits before classes and other organizations may be made through field stations.

#### NATIONAL ANTI-CRIME CONFERENCE

The following resolutions were adopted October 14 on recommendation of the Committee on Education, in which the Association was represented:

In the crusade to prevent crime, colleges have a particular field of service in study of causes and effects. Our industrial civilization, which allows each to work half as long and consume twice as much as was the case a hundred years ago, is based on investigations of the material world extending over several centuries. Progress is now being made on the study of human conduct and its relations to the social order, but we have only the beginnings of sciences such as Penology and Criminology. This conference urges continued efforts at our colleges and universities, to obtain knowledge through scholarly research, concerning the causes and effects of crime with a view to the application of this knowledge to the prevention of crime.

---

It is suggested that in connection with the immediate attack upon crime which this conference plans to launch through publicity and many other agencies, the colleges and universities throughout the country should be urged to present to their students during the current session—in whatever way may be considered best in the local situation—the facts about the alarming increase of crime in the United States and the very real threat this condition presents to the social and economic welfare of our nation.

It is further suggested that such an exposition of the facts about crime will afford a favorable opportunity for emphasizing the necessity that we must as individuals—and thus as a nation—gain a clearer and more compelling conception of the obligation of the individual to the social

order, if we are to have social order instead of social anarchy. This, it will be noted, is the philosophy upon which the NRA is based in connection with another aspect of our national life.

In a long range program, a greater sense of personal responsibility for social and political progress on the part of the graduates of our colleges and universities calls for increased direct participation of college-trained men in political and administrative activities.

To effect this, we recommend that the colleges and universities deal with the practical operations of the political parties and the functions of government in a more realistic manner through (1) formal courses, (2) political forums, and stimulation of students to participate directly in party activities on becoming of voting age.

Further, we suggest that (1) courses in applied citizenship be made available for all senior students, (2) that local chapters of Alumni Associations assume the responsibility through a specific committee for facilitating the entrance year by year of young alumni into party organizations, thereby supplementing in a practical way the training of the undergraduate period.

#### REPRESENTATIVES

Professor J. A. Woodburn represented the Association at the inauguration of President Nash of the University of the City of Toledo, on October 16; Professor H. M. Gehman, at the inauguration of President Titsworth of Alfred University, October 20.

#### MEMBERS WHOSE ADDRESSES ARE UNKNOWN

Information in regard to the present addresses of the following members is invited for use in the membership list. The addresses given are the last known to the office, but are no longer valid.

Anderson, C. C.	(University of Kentucky)	Pittsburgh, Pa.
Brown, W. T.	(Queen's University)	Kingston, Ontario
Chace, F. W.	(Jewish Synagogue)	Mobile, Ala.
Clark, Burton	(Univ. of S. Carolina)	Terre Haute, Ind.
Davis, G. E.	(Athenaeum and Mech. Inst.)	Rochester, N. Y.
Finney, M. Louise	(N. J. College for Women)	Metuchen, N. J.
Graham, J. D.	(Wells College)	New York, N. Y.
Haelsig, O. H.	(Wittenberg College)	Springfield, Ohio
Hazleton, W. B.	(Robert College)	Istanbul, Turkey
Hill, Dora F.	(Hillsdale College)	Dearborn, Mich.
Kelly, T. R.	(Wellesley College)	Wellesley, Mass.
McCown, Ada C.	(Reed College)	New York, N. Y.
Moses, Virginia H.	(Univ. of So. California)	Los Angeles, Calif.

Racer, M. M.	(Beloit College)	Maplewood, Mo.
Reed, Helen J.	(Southern Meth. Univ.)	Dallas, Tex.
Shepard, Flola L.	(Morehead S. T. College)	Morehead, Ky.
Smith, D. F.	(Carnegie Inst. of Tech.)	Pittsburgh, Pa.
Taylor, W. F.	(Baylor University)	Dallas, Tex.
Taylor, W. H.	(Alabama College)	Montevallo, Ala.
Tushek, Fay A.	(Sam Houston S. T. Coll.)	Huntsville, Texas
Wells, E. Frances	(Smith College)	Northampton, Mass.
Whitham, Miriam C.	(College of Idaho)	Caldwell, Idaho
Willard, E. P., Jr.	(Florida S. C. for Women)	Commerce, Texas

## ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE

### ROLLINS COLLEGE REPORT

In April, 1933, the officers of the Association learned that Mr. John A. Rice, professor of classics in Rollins College, Winter Park, Florida, had been dismissed under circumstances which suggested the possible advisability of an inquiry by this Association; and shortly thereafter an investigation was requested by Mr. Rice and, a little later, was invited by the President of the College. Accordingly a sub-committee of two was appointed consisting of Arthur O. Lovejoy, professor of philosophy in Johns Hopkins University, Chairman, and Austin S. Edwards, professor of psychology in the University of Georgia, to visit the College. This committee spent some ten days in May interviewing officers, faculty, and students, and conducting lengthy hearings on charges preferred by the President against Mr. Rice. The Committee attempted to bring about an adjustment of the difficulties which had arisen, and to persuade the administration to state, and to permit the Committee briefly to report, that the College accepted the principles with regard to tenure and grounds for and procedure in dismissal approved by this Association. It was the hope of the Committee that further disturbance in the College, and publicity which might be detrimental to it, might thus be avoided. These efforts were without result; at the conclusion of its visit, therefore, the Committee, upon authorization from the officers of the Association, issued a brief public statement which is appended. It was not, however, at that time decided whether an extensive report in the *Bulletin* would be necessary, but between June 3 and 9, Mr. F. R. Georgia, professor of chemistry, Mr. Ralph R. Lounsbury, professor of government and political science, and Mr. A. P. Tory, assistant professor of philosophy, were dismissed, and the resignations of two other members of the staff were asked for and received. Mr. Cecil R. Oldham, associate professor of history, had resigned on May 25, publicly giving as his reason "disagreement with the administration on fundamental issues of college policy relative to recent incidents;" and at a later date Mr. Theodore Dreier, assistant professor of physics, resigned on similar grounds. The total of dismissals and resignations during the academic year has been eleven, eight of these being directly connected with the incidents with which this report is concerned.

The Committee of Inquiry has thought a full report necessary because of the number of teachers involved, the gravity of some of the charges against the college administration, the fact that the issue of academic freedom is raised in the case in a somewhat novel form, and also because none of the individual incidents can well be under-



stood except in the light of certain general antecedent conditions characteristic of Rollins College. The recent history of the college also seems to the Committee to constitute a not uninteresting episode in American education, especially as an illustration of the working of a certain type of college government.

### *I. General Background*

Rollins College, founded in 1885 by the Congregational churches but now undenominational, is "the oldest institution of higher learning in Florida."<sup>1</sup> During the first forty years of its history, its development was greatly hampered by inadequate endowment and by the economic vicissitudes of the State. In 1925, Dr. Hamilton Holt, distinguished as an advocate of international peace, and former editor of a weekly journal, became its president. Dr. Holt was without experience in teaching or educational administration, but dissatisfaction with the methods of instruction in vogue in his own student days and his experience in journalism had led him to form a conception of a college of a somewhat new type. He accordingly "undertook as president of Rollins to solve some of the problems of the present system of higher education in the United States. Under his leadership the faculty abolished lectures and recitations as obsolete methods of instruction and substituted therefor the Conference Plan of Study." Under this plan students were required to spend six hours daily in three two-hour sessions called "conferences," and two hours in some form of supervised exercise. This introduction into college work of the "eight-hour day" was widely advertised as a distinctive and important innovation. During the "conference-periods" classes assembled with an instructor but spent their time "in study, in conference with the professor, in small group discussions, in writing class papers, preparing outlines," etc.; it was generally understood that a student's entire work could be accomplished in these periods, without other study. Under the original plan "a virtually indiscriminate free elective system" prevailed.<sup>2</sup> In the selection of members of the faculty, little or no importance was attached to interest in research or to distinction in productive scholarship; the emphasis was placed upon pedagogic effectiveness in the informal method of teaching characteristic of the college. Dr. Holt not only formulated the educational plan of the institution, but also devoted much time and energy to giving it publicity throughout the country—often by ingenious methods suggested by his journalistic experience—to raising funds, and to recruiting students. In these activities, which usually entailed his absence from the College

<sup>1</sup> Quotations in this paragraph are from the *Annual Catalogue*, 1932-33, unless otherwise indicated.

<sup>2</sup> Statement of a former member of the faculty.

during a large part of the year, he was highly successful; approximately \$2,000,000 was obtained for buildings, running expenses, and endowment, and the student enrolment was greatly increased.

It was doubtless a natural result of all this that the college became to a peculiar degree identified with the personality of its president; it was remarked by the head of a neighboring university that "Holt is Rollins and Rollins is Holt." As the originator of the general "Rollins plan" the President apparently conceived himself to be the authorized interpreter of its application in detail; and he assumed functions which not only are commonly assigned to the faculty as a body, but were specifically so assigned by the By-Laws, of which the relevant sections are as follows:

"Section 13. The Faculty of the college shall consist of the President, the professors, the principals of departments, and such other instructors as may from time to time be designated by the Trustees or Executive Committee. It shall be entrusted and charged with all matters pertaining to the order, instruction, discipline, and curriculum of the college. It shall have the immediate government and discipline of the students, and shall make and enforce all needful rules and regulations therefor with a view to promoting in the highest degree the students' health and decorum, their mental, moral, and spiritual welfare, and to giving the college, as far as possible, a parental influence and the atmosphere of a Christian home.

"Section 14. The Faculty shall prescribe the qualifications of admission, the text books to be used, the hours for study, recreation and attendance upon the exercises of the college, the standard of scholarship, and the attainments requisite for graduation."

The faculty naturally assumed that they were to exercise the broad powers thus conferred upon them; the President, however, appears to have taken a different view. It is the understanding of the Committee that upon accepting the presidency Dr. Holt requested and was granted by the Board of Trustees exceptional and extreme power and authority, which does not seem to have then been made known by that body to the faculty. Thus the foundations of possible conflict were laid in the beginning, in the exceptional authority of the president. Appointments were made by him without consultation with faculty committees or with the departments concerned—in some cases, in the opinion of senior members of departments, unwise appointments. In 1928, the question of the candidates to be recommended by the college for Rhodes Scholarships was referred by the faculty, with the President's knowledge, to the appropriate committee, by which the selection was thereupon made. When the President learned of the committee's choice, which had been communicated to the nominees, he expressed indignation at the action both of faculty and committee, demanded that



the whole matter be reopened, and was with difficulty dissuaded from insisting that the faculty minutes be altered. This small controversy was in the end amicably adjusted. Shortly before, the faculty had elected committees to deal with various educational questions; the President at a subsequent faculty meeting took the position thus recorded in the minutes: "that the President is responsible to the Board of Trustees and the Faculty is responsible to the President. In the light of this interpretation the committees appointed last April are illegal. President Holt therefore appointed the following committees." The President has further declared that committees are responsible to him and not to the faculty. Thus, as construed by him, all faculty authority in educational matters is derivative from him and faculty decisions are reversible by him at his pleasure. Nor has this been the full extent of his prerogative; on April 26, 1933, the Executive Committee (a body consisting of Dr. Holt as chairman and five local business and professional men) passed a resolution, of which the Committee of Inquiry has been refused a copy, but which, as reported by several of the faculty to whom it was read by the President, gave him absolute authority over the internal affairs of the College, including the right to engage and dismiss members of the faculty, between meetings of the Board or of its Executive Committee. The manner in which these powers were used by the president in the matter of dismissal will be noted later in the report.

The authority thus asserted and on occasion exercised by the President appears to the Committee to have exceeded the custom of academic institutions, to have been in violation of the By-Laws, to have been used at times in a manner humiliating to the faculty, to have been incongruous with the spirit of cooperation in an educational experiment ostensibly characteristic of the College, and to have worked badly in practice. The constitution of the College, as usually interpreted by the President, has been that of an autocracy; and with this there has been, at times, an excessive demand for personal fealty to the head of the institution, as distinct from loyalty to its educational aims and principles, and the expectation of a greater degree of "harmony" and like-mindedness than is ordinarily to be found—or to be desired—among any considerable body of adult persons of the intellectual type.

It is not, however, the case that the conditions outlined resulted, during the earlier years of Dr. Holt's administration, in very frequent or serious friction between president and faculty. This was in part due to the fact that the President's official conduct, in these as in other matters, was variable. His personal relations with individual members of the staff have usually been courteous, genial and kindly; his exercise of his absolute powers has, until recently, been intermittent; and his professed principles, and in many cases his practice, have been those

of a believer in the liberal tradition and in the method of adjusting differences by friendly conference. He has at times invited outspoken criticism from the faculty, and has declared that he does not wish to be surrounded by "yes-men." This more admirable side of President Holt's administrative temper and method has unfortunately intensified rather than diminished the difficulties arising when he has manifested the other side; his frequent enunciation of liberal ideals and expression of generous attitudes have evidently made it hard for many of the faculty to believe that his sudden and extreme departures, especially during the past year, from such principles and attitudes could express his settled purpose, and have encouraged them in some cases to persist in friendly expostulations which have proved extremely dangerous to those who made them.

## II. *Early Incidents of 1933*

A conflict of opinion between president and faculty over a more serious issue than those hitherto mentioned became sharply defined early in 1933. Two years before, as a sequel to a conference at the college in which a number of distinguished educational experts took part, a "New Plan" had been adopted, largely upon President Holt's initiative; and this plan presently came to seem to many of the faculty hard to reconcile with certain features of the original "Rollins Plan." In the latter, as above outlined, the chief emphasis was laid upon the "eight-hour day"—*i. e.*, upon the time spent by the student in the classroom. The old plan also required close and frequent association between student and instructor; and formal examinations were usually not required. The "eight-hour day," and especially the fixed study periods of a whole class in the presence of an instructor, had long been regarded by some of the faculty as savoring too much of the secondary school, and as an unduly rigid and mechanical device for realizing the aim of "individualized education," of which, in itself, they strongly approved; and departures from it were not infrequent. The "New Plan" was somewhat similar to that now in use at the University of Chicago. The College was divided into a Lower and Upper Division, and, especially in the latter, the time-element was minimized and the rôle of the instructor diminished; the student was permitted and encouraged to plan his own work and proceed at his own pace, and to present himself for examination when he believed himself ready for it. Whatever the respective merits of the two plans, it is evident that the ideas underlying them were by no means identical. The old plan was not, however, abandoned at the time of the adoption of the new, but the problem of adjusting them was presently referred to the Curriculum Committee. This Committee, after much deliberation, in January,

1933, "voted against the eight-hour day as incompatible with the [new] Rollins Plan." Its report observed that that plan "is based on achievement rather than time. Its aim is to enable the individual to develop in his own way and along the line of his own interests as fast as his ability will permit. Any system or method we may authorize or suggest must be sufficiently elastic to permit (1) of more hours in class, (2) less hours in class, or (3) no hours in class, as the subject of study may require. . . . The conflict in the present anomalous situation with students under both plans should not be regarded as a weakness or failure of the New Plan."

This report, which seems to the Committee of Inquiry a well-considered one, was extremely ill-received by President Holt. He was, of course, fully entitled to form and urge his own view of it; what is pertinent to the present inquiry is the fact, established by abundant evidence, that he denied the faculty's right to do the same, and manifested great resentment over the Curriculum Committee's attitude towards the "eight-hour day" and the "two-hour conference plan." At the faculty meeting at which the report was presented his opposition was so emphatic that the report was tabled. In conversation with a member of the faculty, the latter testifies, the President said, *à propos* of certain members of the Committee: "There is bad blood there," and "Don't let that crowd use you." The Curriculum Committee was, shortly after, summoned to meet the President and censured by him for its report; to it, and on another occasion to the faculty, he said: "If there is as much as fifty per cent disagreement between me and any member of the faculty on what I consider a fundamental matter, either he or I should go."<sup>1</sup>

The position and utterances of President Holt on the occasion of the report on the eight-hour day were, in the Committee's opinion, a manifest infringement of academic freedom, though the issue over which it took place was an educational rather than a theological, political, or economic one. The declaration that, if a teacher's view differed from the President's "as much as fifty per cent" on any matter which he might regard as "fundamental," either the teacher or the President should go, was, on its face, an official announcement that agreement with the President on questions of educational policy and methods was a requirement for continuance on the faculty—since the President did not "go" and manifestly had no intention of going. The denial of the teacher's right to adhere to his own judgment and to advocate his own views in committee and faculty meetings was the more unjustifiable because the recommendations which evoked this declaration of the President's were, as it seems to this Committee,

<sup>1</sup> To the question of the Association's Committee whether he made this and other statements reported by faculty witnesses President Holt has declined to reply.

rather obvious implications of a new plan already adopted with his approval. It was not a question of supporting or not supporting the more general and fundamental principles of the College. No teacher having a high degree of professional self-respect is, the Committee believes, likely to accept service in an institution in which freedom of individual opinion, and the exercise of professional responsibility, on educational matters is denied in the degree in which it was denied by President Holt on this occasion.

Four days after the faculty meeting at which the report of the Curriculum Committee was finally discussed, Professor Rice, a member of that Committee, was notified that his resignation was desired. The belief has been expressed by some members of the faculty that there was a causal relation between the two events. The Committee understands that President Holt does not admit any conscious connection between them in his own mind, and it therefore expresses no conclusion on the point. All that can be said is that the temper of suspicion and hostility toward a number of the faculty, which dates from the Curriculum Committee's report, was psychologically likely to manifest itself in some aggressive action. One or two utterances subsequent to Mr. Rice's dismissal may more appropriately be included in this section, as illustrative of the official conception of the status of members of the faculty in Rollins College. Two professors testify (with slight variations of phrasing) that Dr. Holt said to them, on separate occasions, when urged to give Mr. Rice a hearing before a faculty committee or some other body: "Why should I give him a hearing before anybody else? When you want to fire a cook, you don't go out and get a committee of the neighbors to tell you what to do, do you?" A member of the Executive Committee, the proprietor of a local department store, at a meeting of that Committee, justified the mode of government in the college and the procedure in the dismissal of professors by the analogy of his own practice in dealing with his employees. Neither President Holt nor the other members of the Executive Committee present took exception to this analogy.

### *III. The Dismissal of Professor Rice*

It is necessary first to make clear the status of Mr. Rice as to tenure in February, 1933. He had been appointed to a professorship on July 12, 1930, and received from President Holt on July 13 a letter containing the following: "I call you with the expectation that it will be permanent, but as I told you, I feel that either of us are at perfect liberty to sever the connection at the end of one or two years with or without any given reason and no hard feelings on either side." In the opinion of the Committee this was an official notification that, after two years of

probation, Mr. Rice might understand his tenure to be permanent, and terminable only for "given reasons." President Holt, however, in reply to an inquiry from the Secretary of the Association wrote in April, 1933: "Automatic reappointment is assumed in the case of all associate or full professors who have served at Rollins in those ranks for three full years or more satisfactorily. The vacancy in our Classical Department has come about properly under the above provisions of the Trustees, for the incumbent had not yet completed his third year of service and a continuation of his services was not deemed best." This statement of President Holt is misleading. It is evident that a new rule adopted by the Trustees in 1932 could not abrogate a specific understanding with Mr. Rice as to the length of his probationary period, notified to him in writing in 1930. President Holt, however, even when his attention was called to this consideration by the Committee, still took the position that his letter of July 13, 1930, was not binding upon him or the College, in view (a) of the Board's later resolution, and (b) of the fact that the understanding as to terms of appointment specified in the letter had not been previously authorized by the Board. On the significance of this reasoning the Committee refrains from comment. Aside from the special circumstances of the appointment of Mr. Rice, the President's statement to the Secretary of the Association is misleading in another respect. The Trustees' resolution of February 16, 1932, to which he refers, gave no assurance of "automatic" annual reappointment of professors and associate professors after three years of service. Its language is as follows:

"Until Rollins College achieves a greater measure of financial stability, the Trustees find it impossible to establish permanent standards for tenure of office, though the intention is to do so at the earliest possible moment. Therefore, while it is necessary to continue assistant professors and instructors on the one-year appointment basis, the Trustees are glad to assure professors and associate professors who have served in this rank for three or more years that the policy of the Trustees will be to continue their services without annual notification unless reasonable notice be given to the contrary."

The meaning of the second sentence of this resolution is manifestly determined by its final clause. While it has the appearance of giving some new assurance as to tenure of higher positions after the first three years, its only actual effect is to require the administration to give "reasonable notice" of non-reappointment and to relieve it of the obligation to send formal annual notice of reappointment in other cases. Subject to the one proviso of due notice, the unqualified right not to reappoint teachers of any grade and of any length of service is fully reserved by the resolution; and President Holt has stated to the As-



sociation's Committee that "at the present time no professor has any tenure beyond one year."

He has, however, given the Committee conflicting interpretations of the action taken with regard to Professor Rice; at times he has described it as an ordinary case of non-reappointment in accordance with the above resolution of the Trustees, at other times as a dismissal for cause, for which he recognized some obligation to give reasons; and at the time of the Committee's visit he presented his reasons with great fullness and detail, supporting them by some fifty written statements, mainly in the form of affidavits, which, in preparation for the Committee's coming, he and the Dean of the College had obtained from students and members of the administrative and teaching staff. Part of this evidence, it became clear during the hearings, was not known to the President before the dismissal. The Committee pointed out to him that any allegations not before him at that time threw no light upon the question of the grounds of dismissal, and was therefore of no interest to the Committee; but it was not found practicable to exclude from the hearings material which the Committee regarded as irrelevant.<sup>1</sup>

Whether there were adequate reasons for this dismissal is, however, a part of the general question on which the Committee is required to report. It is not possible in the available space, nor would it be useful, to reproduce the mass of material presented by the college officers,<sup>2</sup> nor Mr. Rice's replies thereto. Much of this material relates to petty personal differences common in small communities, or to other trivialities without public interest. The significance of most of the incidents mentioned in it lay, in the view of the administration, in their cumulative effect. As to this, the Committee finds that Professor Rice had unquestionably much disturbed the harmony of the local community and had seriously offended a number of his colleagues and other persons. This was partly due to his outspoken criticism of certain features of the College life which he disapproved. He had attacked the debating system on the ground that it tends to substitute for the serious examination of public questions a form of competitive sport, and is largely a training in the sophistic art of making the worse appear the better reason. He had opposed the introduction and multiplication of fraternities and sororities as unnecessary in a small college, as a divisive influence, and as leading to an undesirable type of student politics. It was charged that he had attempted to persuade individual students to withdraw from these organizations; this charge the Committee finds

<sup>1</sup> The weight of some of the statements adverse to Mr. Rice is, in the Committee's opinion, diminished by the fact that they were given upon solicitation from administrative officers after the dismissal and also after the incidents recorded in Section IV and the first paragraph of Section VI of this report.

<sup>2</sup> The Committee has requested of President Holt that copies of these statements be placed in its hands, with the understanding that they will be returned and the names of witnesses not published. The request has not been granted.

to be unsubstantiated. He had attacked certain features of the athletic system and some of the methods of the department of physical culture. He had, in conversation, criticized certain of the chapel services as lacking in dignity and unsuited to the edifice in which they were held. He had argued that a serious weakness in American education lay in an excessive feminization of its teaching body and had disparaged the work of women teachers. Whatever the merits of his views on these questions—on which the Committee is not called upon to pronounce—they were, of course, views which he was entitled to urge; but they drew upon him the hostility of considerable groups among students and faculty. This effect was, however, much intensified by the frequently vehement, sometimes intemperate, and in several instances discourteous language in which his criticisms were couched, and by a sometimes inopportune humor—his paradoxical or ironical expressions of ideas being taken literally by some hearers. In these respects and in certain others affecting his personal relations with a number of his colleagues and others, Mr. Rice seems to the Committee to have fallen into some serious errors of judgment and some of taste. The evidence appears to show, however, that he made every reasonable effort to restore cordial relations with those to whom he was told that he had given offense. Of those members of the teaching staff whose opinions were communicated to the Committee, approximately half disapproved of the dismissal, and most of these expressed warm esteem for Mr. Rice's personal qualities and high admiration for his abilities and his services to the College; nearly all of the latter statements contained remarks similar in substance to the two following, which the Committee thinks it only just to cite: "I think that Mr. Rice has been a great stimulation to the campus, and as a consequence a great and needed benefit. . . . He has been too outspoken against people he doesn't like both in the town and faculty, to their faces as well as behind their backs. His courage sweeps aside the value and deceit of discretion, and he says what he thinks without thought of consequence, when too emotionally roused. He has little patience with narrow-mindedness and expects that every individual in the world is bent on broadening; that, if he isn't, and Mr. Rice makes him think, he will be grateful." "Mr. Rice's indiscretions seem to be almost entirely the result of his scrupulous intellectual honesty. They are not to be attributed to fundamental ill-will, or to low motives. Mr. Rice is strongly opposed to insincerity and sham. When he found it, he did not hesitate to expose it." It was admitted by an administrative officer whose general attitude was adverse to Mr. Rice that the utterances and incidents complained of would probably have caused no serious difficulty in an institution of another type or in a larger place. With this the Committee agrees. It concludes that a professor who

had officially been given reason to suppose his tenure permanent was dismissed upon charges which, in so far as they are substantiated, would in most American institutions of higher education not be regarded as grounds for that action in such a case.

To this the Committee feels obliged in justice to add that there became apparent with the progress of its inquiry two positive reasons why it might have been expected that the retention of Mr. Rice in the faculty of Rollins College would be regarded as highly desirable. (a) It became evident, after interviews with students who had taken his courses, that he had shown himself an unusually stimulating and effective teacher, peculiarly adapted to the informal method of instruction in use in the college. A large proportion of those who had come for any considerable time under his instruction pronounced him either the best teacher or one of the best they had ever had. To Mr. Rice's exceptional teaching ability President Holt has borne testimony. He once described him as "a teacher after my own heart," adding, "they didn't teach Greek that way in my time;" in April, 1933, he said to a member of the faculty that he "entirely approved of his (Mr. Rice's) teaching method, in fact he thought it the method that ought to be used;" and to the Committee he observed that Professor Rice was undeniably a "mind-quickenning teacher." (b) The Committee finds that the charge against Mr. Rice which President Holt has presented as "perhaps more serious" than any other is the reverse of the fact. It is to the effect that Mr. Rice's teaching was merely "upsetting" to immature minds, that "he destroyed youthful ideals without inculcating anything equally constructive or commendable in their place." What is shown by student testimony and other evidence is that he sought, in dealing with ethical and other questions in his courses and individual conferences, to bring students to substitute, in place of assumptions accepted through tradition or convention, personal convictions reached through reflection; and that he did this chiefly, not by lecturing, but by a searching and skilful use of the method of the Socratic dialogue. That some resented this method, and that others proved incapable of the effort of thought which it required and were troubled by it, is evidently true. But such results in occasional instances are manifestly inevitable incidents in any attempt to make the years of college study a period of intellectual awakening followed by a coherent reorganization of individual beliefs and standards; and to such awakening and reorganization the evidence indicates that Mr. Rice's teaching was persistently directed. The standards which he supported on ethical questions, especially those questions of personal conduct which often arise in student life, were rigorous and fundamentally conservative; and he was especially successful in steadying the minds of students who had



merely impatiently broken loose from traditional codes, and in assisting them to reach an intelligent self-discipline. Evidence to this effect given by students was extremely impressive; it is supported by that of a number of the faculty; and in two cases parents of students who had learned that this investigation was going on have written to the Committee to express their gratitude for Mr. Rice's services to their children. It is clear that Mr. Rice gave generously of his time and energy outside the classroom to such efforts to help individual students to find themselves. In the Committee's judgment his dismissal eliminated from the faculty a teacher who appears on the one hand to have done more than any other to provoke questioning, discussion, and the spirit of critical inquiry among his students, and on the other hand, to have aimed, with exceptional success, at constructive results both in thought and character. The presentation of the charge here in question against Mr. Rice, some of the testimony given in support of it, and other evidence, appear to the Committee to show that one of the factors in his dismissal was pressure from some members of the faculty and others, to whom his insistence upon a reflective re-examination by students of traditional ideas was fundamentally objectionable. Yet statements of the educational aims and methods of Rollins College would suggest that the first concern of its administration would be to obtain and keep teachers of this type and quality. The dismissal, it need hardly be added, took place at a time when, because of general economic conditions, it was likely to entail extreme hardship to the teacher concerned and those dependent upon him. This aspect of the matter was brought to the notice of the administration by some of Mr. Rice's colleagues; one of President Holt's replies is reported by a witness as follows: "The American people will not let a man like John Rice starve."

Turning to the procedure in the case, the Committee finds that no hearing, in the sense in which the term is understood by this Association, was granted Mr. Rice before dismissal. The President asked for his resignation on February 27, assuring him that if he resigned quietly the administration would give him every assistance toward obtaining a new position. He declined to resign, and as a result of the conversation which ensued the President apparently relented and agreed to consider the matter further. A few days later he informed Mr. Rice that his decision not to reappoint was final. Nevertheless there followed a period of three weeks during which Mr. Rice and his friends were given some reason to suppose the question was still open. During this period the President consented to meet a large number of the faculty who gave testimony in Mr. Rice's behalf, but the request made by some of these that he grant a hearing in accordance with the principles approved by this Association and the Association of American Colleges was

refused. At the final interview between him and Mr. Rice on March 21, he said, "I am the judge," and referred to the "stream of evidence" on which his decision was based. Mr. Rice replied, "If the 'stream of evidence' is going to tip the scale against me, I want to be told the charges and be confronted with my accusers." To this the President made no answer, and Mr. Rice received the next morning written notice of dismissal, effective at the end of the academic year. The decision was made wholly by the President—who, the Committee became convinced during its inquiry at the college, had never critically tested or weighed the evidence—and what were called "hearings" before him took place after he had twice announced his decision. It has since been asserted by President Holt that Mr. Rice might have asked and would have received a hearing before the Board of Trustees; but the possibility of this was, the Committee finds, never intimated to him, and was negated by the President's assertion, supported by a resolution of the Executive Committee, of his full authority to dismiss any teacher. It is also the fact that in two later cases such hearings, when formally applied for, were not granted.

#### *IV. Incidents Following the Dismissal of Professor Rice*

A month after this dismissal, and shortly after President Holt learned that it had been brought to the attention of the officers of the Association, there began a series of incidents which should be briefly recorded. On April 26, individual members of the faculty were called to the President's office and (according to the testimony of one, agreeing in substance with that of others) "notice was then given that any further discussion or agitation for the reinstatement of Professor Rice on the part of faculty or students, in class-periods, on the outside, or in groups would be considered an act of disloyalty to the College and dealt with summarily." The President also read the resolution of the Executive Committee of the same date, giving him, between meetings of that Committee or the Board of Trustees, all the powers of the Board including that of dismissal.<sup>1</sup> On May 3, ten of the faculty were summoned in a body before the President and other administrative officers and asked first, "What is it you gentlemen want?" A friendly discussion followed, in which suggestions were made looking to better conditions of professorial tenure and to certain changes in the organization of the College, and the President was requested to invite an investigation of the Rice case by the Association. These suggestions were not unfavorably received by Dr. Holt and the meeting seemed about to end in a cordial spirit of mutual understanding, when the President abruptly took an-

<sup>1</sup> Another incident of a similar character and approximately the same date is recorded in Section VI of this report.

other tone. After again reading the recent resolution of the Executive Committee, he placed in the hands of each of those present a typed sheet containing a declaration that the signer agreed to accept the President's (oral) statement of his authority in all college matters and to abide by it; notice was given that the sheets must be returned with a pledge of acceptance by a specified hour that afternoon.<sup>1</sup> This demand evoked general and vigorous protest, and Mr. Lounsbury, the senior professor present, urged the President not to press the issue, said that he himself could not conscientiously sign, and observed that the publication of such a document would be unfortunate for the College; "in order," he concluded, "to avoid that possibility, I'll pass my copy back." Professor Georgia took the same position, and all the sheets were then returned to the President, who thereupon said: "Then, gentlemen, we are at an issue." In fact, however, no action was at that time taken against any of those who had declined to sign. Through the intervention of another administrative officer, the meeting was given a happier turn, there was further general discussion of questions of college policy, and the President agreed to consider some of the suggestions presented to him.

The tendency, and presumable object, of these incidents, especially of the second, was to force a cleavage of the faculty into two groups, those who were and those who were not willing to pledge themselves to accept a new assertion by the President of autocratic powers contrary to academic custom and to the principles of this profession and not sanctioned by the College Charter or By-Laws, and to refrain from further advocacy of college policies or educational methods opposed by him. Threats of dismissal were clearly implied, though not then carried out, against those who would not give such pledges; and, at a time when an investigation by this Association was pending, all teachers were given reason to believe that it would be hazardous to be counted among the "supporters of Professor Rice."

#### V. *The Dismissal of Professors Georgia and Lounsbury*

Other foreshadowings of further dismissals soon became apparent. A member of the faculty on May 6, in a letter to the General Secretary of the Association in justification of the dismissal of Mr. Rice, added: "The two lawyers of the faculty and two or three others who are supporting him should also be removed." During the Committee's visit to the College it was told by President Holt that some trustees were pressing so strongly for the dismissal of other professors that it would be difficult to prevent it. The Committee believes that, in view of the President's relation to the Executive Committee and the Board, it was wholly within

<sup>1</sup> The substance of this document is given as reported by members of the faculty present. The Committee has asked President Holt for a copy, but has been unable to obtain it.

his power to prevent it if he had wished to do so. The injustice of the contemplated action, and the inevitable injury to the College, were pointed out by the Committee; and nothing further was done by the administrative authorities until the close of the college year, when five additional dismissals or involuntary resignations took place. Three of these were of members of the staff definitely on one-year appointments; with these cases the Committee does not deal, except to say that all those affected were regarded as "friends of Professor Rice," that their non-reappointment was due to their attitude on questions of college policy and administrative methods, and that the requirement of due notice accepted by most reputable institutions was disregarded by Rollins College. The dismissal of Professors Georgia and Lounsbury constitutes, in some respects, the most serious of the incidents with which this report is concerned; but it may be dealt with briefly, since the essential facts are simple, and established by evidence which the College authorities have not denied except with respect to one point.

(1) *Status as to Tenure.* Mr. Georgia had held his professorship for seven years. Mr. Lounsbury had completed three years in February, 1933, and had on March 11 received from President Holt a note saying: though "those professors who have held professorial rank for three or more years need not be notified of their reappointment, . . . I do this, for I hope you will continue at Rollins, where you have made an enviable reputation for yourself." Mr. Lounsbury replied accepting the reappointment. The probationary period of three years had thus passed in the case of both dismissed professors, and one of them had in addition been officially notified of the continuance of his tenure.

(2) *Grounds of Dismissal.* The ground for dismissal stated by President Holt both to Professor Georgia and Professor Lounsbury was that they had been leaders in the "agitation" of the Rice case, and that if they "returned to the college next year, it would be more difficult to restore harmony." Both had in fact been active in attempting to dissuade the President from dismissing Mr. Rice, had brought together a number of the faculty to testify before him in Mr. Rice's favor, had, after the dismissal, made clear in conversation their disapproval of it, and had persistently urged the acceptance by the College of the principles concerning tenure and procedure in removal approved by this Association and the Association of American Colleges. They also had (with others of the faculty) testified strongly in Mr. Rice's behalf to this Association's Committee, and when, in view of President Holt's insistence that two other administrative officers be present at the Committee's hearings, the Committee had asked that two members of the faculty besides Mr. Rice be also present, Messrs. Georgia and Lounsbury had, with the President's consent, served in this capacity.

Mr. Lounsbury, when first notified by the President that his dismissal was contemplated on the ground mentioned, replied that he "became involved in the Rice case, first, through a natural desire to help a colleague who was in difficulty, and second, because [he] felt that the integrity of the teaching profession was being assailed at Rollins." Mr. Georgia testifies that, at a similar interview, he did not admit responsibility for "the trouble in the Rice case;" that, when asked if he was "still interested in the College and its future," he replied that he "still thought the College had possibilities for the future if the matter of tenure and similar things were put on a sound basis;" and that he indicated his intention, if he remained, "to continue to advocate such changes." Mr. Lounsbury and Mr. Georgia both deny having engaged in any improper "agitation" over the Rice case; and the Committee finds no evidence of such agitation on their part or on that of any of the faculty. They gave no publicity to the matter, did not, indeed, exercise their right to bring it to the knowledge of the officers of the Association, and used their influence with students to prevent them from publicly criticizing the administration. Mr. Lounsbury, an intimate friend and Yale classmate of the President, had on March 6 written him as follows:

I am sorry if, because I have sometimes seen, or thought I saw, some possible improvement, here and there, in policies or methods, this indicated, in your mind, any lack of loyalty to you or to the institution. I have gone, and, until you inform me otherwise, shall doubtless continue to go, upon the supposition that loyalty does not call for mere subservency nor foreclose an honest expression of opinion. . . . So far as I know, every member of this faculty has at heart what he or she conceives to be the best interest of Rollins. . . . Would you mind if I suggested that an occasional display of individual red blood is not an evidence of concerted "bad blood," and that college professors who are willing to surrender that thing which is the very fundamental of their profession—namely, their mental integrity—are not apt to be those who so far appreciate the dignity of their calling as to be of any value to Rollins?

President Holt at this time expressed his "complete sympathy with this point of view." Mr. Lounsbury on May 25 proposed to Dr. Holt a "get-together" meeting between the President and any teachers whom he suspected of being disaffected towards him, "not to go over the past but simply to show our good-will and willingness to cooperate." This proposal was not adopted by the President.

In view of these facts, with those stated in §§ II and IV, the Committee concludes that Professors Georgia and Lounsbury were dismissed because of their expression in faculty gatherings and in conversations with President Holt, with colleagues and friends, and with this Com-



mittee, of disagreement with certain of the President's views on college policy and of disapproval of his action with respect to Mr. Rice, and, in the case of Mr. Georgia, because of his expressed intention of continuing to advocate within the College the adoption of the principles as to tenure, grounds for and procedure in removal, and faculty participation in college government, which have been approved by this Association and other educational bodies. Dismissal for such reasons is, in the Committee's judgment, evidence of an extreme intolerance of legitimate criticism and dissent in the College. Further evidence of this is to be seen in the fact that several other teachers under suspicion were, about the same time, called before the President and asked whether they felt they could be "happy" in the College under the prevailing order of things; it was intimated that a negative answer would be inconsistent with their continuance in office. It was thus, at the end of the college year, made clear by action, as previously by announcement, that agreement with the President on any college matters which he may pronounce "fundamental," and an ability to be, or appear to be, "happy" under a one-man system of college government, may be required of members of the faculty, and that teachers of professorial rank, of high personal character, and of "enviable reputation" in their professional work are liable to summary dismissal if they seem to the President to fail to meet these requirements. The Committee wishes to add that Mr. Georgia and Mr. Lounsbury seem to it, in their action in the matter, to have defended with dignity and courage the generally accepted standards and principles of their profession and also the genuine interests of Rollins College.

(3) *Reasonable Notice.* The Trustees' resolution of Feb. 16, 1932, already cited, assured professors of more than three years' service that it would be "the policy of the Trustees to continue their services without annual notification, unless reasonable notice be given to the contrary." The term "reasonable notice" has been officially defined by President Holt as meaning notice at least six months before the end of the period of annual appointment; *i. e.*, before March 1. Intimation that their dismissal was under consideration was first given Professors Georgia and Lounsbury by President Holt on May 29. They at once raised the question of their contractual right to due notice. This, they were informed, could only be dealt with by the Board of Trustees. On June 6, the day after Commencement, Mr. Georgia and Mr. Lounsbury were separately called before the Executive Committee of the Trustees and asked whether they would accept leaves of absence for one year, with the understanding that they were not to return to the College; under this condition, Mr. Georgia was offered half-salary for the year, Mr. Lounsbury, one-quarter salary. Both indicated their unwillingness

to accept these terms of settlement, as inconsistent with the Trustees' previous assurance of due notice, and, in Mr. Lounsbury's case, on the further ground that he had been officially notified of reappointment in March. No decision of the Executive Committee was made known until June 9, after the President, many of the faculty, and most of the students had left the College; on this date Messrs. Georgia and Lounsbury learned, first through the newspapers and subsequently by official notice, that they had been dismissed. It is clear that notification was delayed after the Executive Committee's decision. In view of provisions of the College Charter and of the President's statement that only the Board of Trustees has power of dismissal, the authority of the Executive Committee to dismiss was challenged by Professors Lounsbury and Georgia. The matter was therefore brought before a special meeting of the Board held on July 25, and it was then voted by that body that they "be not re-engaged." The official notice of this action sent the professors affected proposed no payment even of partial salaries.

In view of the assurance of "reasonable notice" given by the Trustees to all professors, and of the notice of reappointment given Mr. Lounsbury on March 11, it is the Committee's opinion that the dismissal of Mr. Georgia and Mr. Lounsbury, even though preceded by a tender of fractions of their salaries, at so late a date, after the close of the college session, was a breach of faith on the part of the President, the Executive Committee, and the Board of Trustees. The object of a rule of due notice is to assure to teachers opportunity to seek positions in other institutions before appointments for the ensuing academic year have, as a rule, been settled, and before the teachers concerned have made local financial commitments for another year. This object is not realized by notice given on the date mentioned. Under existing economic conditions, moreover, notification of dismissal at such a date can only be described as an act of peculiar ruthlessness. The Committee points out also that the recommendations of the Conference Committee, endorsed by this Association and the Association of American Colleges (of which Rollins College is a member) are to the effect that, except through the termination of explicitly limited terms of appointment, "dismissals for other reasons than immorality or treason should not ordinarily take effect in less than a year from the time the decision is reached."

(4) *Hearings.* Professors Georgia and Lounsbury formally requested hearings before the Board of Trustees. The Secretary of the Board, in notifying them of the final action taken on July 25, added that, as they had had "hearing before the Executive Committee, a transcript of which was available to Trustees," the Board had voted that "no further hearing would be given." The meetings of these pro-

fessors with the Executive Committee were in no relevant sense "hearings." Messrs. Georgia and Lounsbury, it appears from their testimony, were summoned before that Committee, not to meet charges and present evidence thereon, but to discuss possible terms of pecuniary settlement in composition of what, in their view, would be a breach of contract. The Committee of Inquiry does not find that any hearing upon specified charges, and judicial in purpose and procedure, was granted these professors either by the Executive Committee or the Board of Trustees.

VI. *Attitude of President Holt towards Investigation by This Association*

This constitutes an especially serious and, so far as the Committee is aware, unique feature of the case. It seems, therefore, necessary to recite the facts *in extenso*. On April 8, the General Secretary of the Association wrote President Holt that he had "received information that the tenure conditions in Rollins College are not what we should consider satisfactory and that, in particular, the vacancy in question" in the Department of Classics, for which the Association's Appointment Service had been asked to submit names, "may be due to a dismissal not in accordance with our principles." The President was, therefore, invited by the Secretary to send a "statement on the general subject or on the specific case." On receipt of this letter President Holt asked members of the College faculty whether they had written to the Association concerning the dismissal of Professor Rice, telling them that if they had done so he would have considered it an act of great disloyalty and would have had to deal with it accordingly. In some cases he interrupted classes to put this question. No member of the faculty, not even Mr. Rice, had in fact written the Association on the subject at that date; knowledge of the dismissal had come to the Secretary from other sources. In notifying members of the Association and others that they must not inform its officers concerning a dismissal, and in threatening them with penalties (generally understood to be dismissal) if they did so, President Holt was, in the Committee's judgment, guilty of an unwarrantable interference with their personal and professional rights; the incident was of itself conclusive evidence of improper restriction of the teacher's freedom in Rollins College. Mr. Rice subsequently informed the President of his intention to appeal to the Association, and soon after (April 26) received from him a note transmitting a resolution of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees of the same date, that "the services of Professor John A. Rice be dispensed with for the remainder of the academic year 1932-33, effective this date," and that Professor Rice "be requested to remove all his personal effects from the campus by noon, April 28, 1933." This resolution was also



given out to the newspapers. President Holt afterwards wrote the Secretary of the Association that this action was taken, not because of Mr. Rice's "statement that he intended to appeal the case to the A. A. U. P. but because of the demoralizing and disrupting effect such a controversy would impose upon the orderly and efficient operation of the College while the controversy was taking place on its campus." This explanation, in the Committee's opinion, while appearing to deny, in fact indicates that the action was taken because of Mr. Rice's appeal to the Association; for his dismissal had already taken place a month earlier, and the only new "controversy" which was in prospect was the hearing on the case which he had requested of Committee A. The easily predictable effect, moreover, of this action was to convey the impression that that appeal was resented by the college authorities, and once more to give the faculty to understand that these authorities were opposed to an investigation—which had not at that time been definitely decided upon. It also, however, had the effect of causing the officers of the Association to consider an investigation advisable.

President Holt, however, later changed his position. On May 3, the members of the faculty who were summoned to his office urged, as above recorded, that he himself invite an inquiry by the Association. Meanwhile a brief summary of the facts then known concerning the dismissal of Professor Rice had been drafted by the legal advisor of Committee A with a view to prompt publication; it concluded as follows: "While the implications of the foregoing incident can not be confidently stated until it has been investigated, they may be extremely serious. Hence this note is now published for information of members of the Association." This draft was communicated to President Holt with the request that he advise the Secretary if it contained "any erroneous statement of fact." Dr. Holt replied (May 4), *inter alia*, that if the Chairman of Committee A "deems an investigation desirable, Rollins cordially invites any representative or representatives he may select to visit Rollins College for the purpose of permitting me to place before your Association all the material at my disposal on which we based our decision. I should be glad to afford the Association every possible facility for you to form a full and impartial opinion." The note prepared by the legal advisor of Committee A was consequently not published in the May *Bulletin*.

When the Committee of Inquiry met President Holt on May 16, he first laid before it in writing seven questions, of which the first, with the Committee's reply, was as follows: Q. "Is your inquiry confined strictly to the failure to reappoint Professor Rice? If not, please specify what other issues are involved." A. "No; while the inquiry will deal primarily with the case of Professor Rice, it may be directed also to

ascertaining the rules and practice of the College with respect to professorial tenure, the procedure in cases of dismissal, the functions and powers of the faculty, and any other matters which may develop in the course of the investigation which it might be important for members of the teaching profession to know." To this reply President Holt strongly demurred, declaring that nothing in his "letter of invitation of May 4 agreed to discuss anything except the reasons for the failure to reappoint Professor Rice." The Committee explained that the Association is interested primarily in the maintenance of proper conditions with respect to tenure, academic freedom, etc., and regards individual cases as significant chiefly as evidence bearing on these general questions. Without agreeing to the desired limitation of the scope of the inquiry, the Committee consented to hear first the case concerning Mr. Rice, leaving the further questions for subsequent consideration. It was therefore evident at this time that the President was unwilling that the Association should be informed as to the tenure and status of members of the College faculty; and in a letter to the General Secretary of July 29, 1933, he wrote that "never to this day was the question of tenure officially brought up or agreed upon by your Committee and Rollins College as one that should be mutually considered." This last statement, however, is not in accord with the fact; on May 22, the oral hearings on the Rice case having been concluded, the Chairman of the Committee formally brought before the President in writing the question whether the College accepted and would in practice conform to the principles concerning tenure, dismissal, etc., embodied in the Conference Committee's report, and approved by this Association and the Association of American Colleges. Dr. Holt not only did not decline to consider the question, but invited the Chairman to meet with him and the Executive Committee of the Trustees that afternoon to discuss it further. At this meeting the existing rule of the Board of Trustees concerning tenure was officially cited, and the general question was "mutually considered" at some length, though with negative result. The letter of July 29 from President Holt to the General Secretary of the Association also gave notice that he was still unwilling to have this question considered. Yet elsewhere in the same letter he informed the Secretary of the Association that, with respect to tenure, "Rollins has been governed by years of practice known to all familiar with its history," and again cited the above-mentioned resolution of the Trustees adopted in the preceding year.

A less wavering but not less inevitably ineffectual attempt has been made by President Holt to prevent investigation of another matter of legitimate concern to the academic profession. He was on June 12 advised that the Committee had learned of the dismissals of Messrs.

Georgia and Lounsbury and three younger members of the faculty, and that these made "the case appear a more serious and important one" than it had previously seemed; and he was requested to inform the Committee as to the "specific grounds" for these dismissals and the procedure followed therein. This request was repeated on June 26, with a statement of four charges against the College administration concerning its action in the cases of Professors Georgia and Lounsbury. The request was again repeated on July 17, and August 1; some twenty-five specific statements of witnesses, which might be regarded as reflecting upon the President or the Executive Committee, have been communicated to him textually or in summary; and requests have been made for a number of pertinent documents. No reply to the charges or answer to the questions sent him has been made by the President and in his letter of July 29 he officially declared that "the consent of Rollins to an investigation of the reasons for not reappointing John A. Rice as Professor of Classics did not extend to or in any manner include the cases of any other professors, and Rollins does not consent to so extend it." The position of the College authorities, therefore, is that they have been and are willing to give the Association information concerning the dismissal of one professor, but are not willing to give it information concerning the subsequent dismissals of other professors. Upon this position the Committee conceives that comment would be superfluous.<sup>1</sup>

It is the Committee's understanding that the primary purpose of such an inquiry made by the Association is to inform its members and others of the teaching profession concerning present conditions of professional service in the institution investigated. Any conclusions as to these conditions at Rollins College, it should be clear from the foregoing record, must be based upon the practice of the College in the year 1932-33, rather than upon the provisions of its By-Laws, the general declarations of the Board of Trustees, or the statements of the President. For the two former have in practice been disregarded; and the statements of the President have been conflicting. He has, on different occasions, ascribed the power of dismissal (*a*) to himself, (*b*) to the Executive Committee, (*c*) exclusively to the Board of Trustees; he has informed representatives of the Association that professors and associate professors who have had three years of service are thereafter "automatically reappointed," and also that no professor has more than one year's tenure; he has described as probationary the status of a teacher in his third year of service who had at appointment been notified that his probationary period would be two years; he has, as President, given another professor unqualified written notice of reappointment, and three months later has treated this notice as without official force, on the ground that it had not been authorized by the Board of Trustees;

<sup>1</sup> See supplementary paragraph on page 438.

both to the faculty and to this Committee he has represented the Trustees' resolution of February 16, 1932, as an effective safeguard against dismissal of professors without reasonable notice, and has subsequently recommended dismissals without such notice; and he has assured the Committee that any professor against whom charges are made that might, if substantiated, lead to dismissal for cause is entitled to a hearing upon the charges before the Board of Trustees, and has since, with the Board of which he is president, failed to grant such hearings, when formally applied for. It is necessary to add only that there has been no evidence that a change in the conditions obtaining in 1932-33 has taken place or is contemplated. The repeated efforts of the Committee to obtain some declaration that the future practice of the College with respect to tenure, reasonable notice of non-reappointment, procedure in dismissal for cause, and faculty participation in the determination of educational policies will conform to the principles regarded by this Association as acceptable have been unsuccessful.

Respectfully submitted:

ARTHUR O. LOVEJOY, *Chairman*,  
AUSTIN S. EDWARDS

---

Approved for publication by the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, S. A. Mitchell, *Chairman*.

The Committee has received from President Holt a letter, dated October 10, on behalf of the Executive Committee, in which he writes: "These cases (of Messrs. Georgia and Lounsbury) Rollins has not invited you to investigate. Our counsel advises us that Rollins should not participate in them because of contemplated litigation in the courts." The Committee of Inquiry, after taking the opinion of the legal advisor of Committee A, does not consider that the possibility or prospect of a future attempt by teachers to recover, through legal proceedings, salaries which they believe to be due them, is a legitimate reason for withholding, or endeavoring to withhold, from the representatives of the professional organization of college and university teachers, information concerning the rules and practice of an institution with respect to tenure, procedure in, grounds for, and notice of dismissal, either in general or as exemplified in individual cases. If an institution has, with respect to these matters, no facts to conceal, the Committee is unable to see why it should seek to conceal them from any organization or any individuals whom they professionally or personally concern. It is to be noted, also, that President Holt's demurrer to any general inquiry into the rules and practice of the College in these particulars was first made at his meeting with the Committee on May 15, when no intimation of possible legal proceedings had been made.

## APPENDIX A

### PRELIMINARY REPORT

*(Released May 25, 1933)*

The principal purpose of the inquiries of visiting committees of the American Association of University Professors is to ascertain, for the information of the members of the educational profession, whether the conditions of professional service in the institution visited are in accord with the standards approved by the Association, especially with respect to freedom of teaching, security of tenure for those not appointed for definitely limited terms, and the right to a fair hearing upon any charges which, if sustained, might lead to dismissal for cause.

The Committee which has visited Rollins College has been most courteously received by President Holt, and has had the privilege of conferences with him on these and other matters, and also with numerous members of the faculty, and with the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees. The committee has, in particular, inquired of President Holt whether the administrative practice of the college in regard to academic freedom, tenure, and procedure in removal, may be expected to be in accord with the principles and recommendations approved by the Association of American Colleges, the Association of University Professors, and the Association of Governing Boards. It is informed that President Holt is not at present prepared to reply to this inquiry, but that he will be glad to take the matter under advisement with the Board of Trustees.

The existing rules and recent practice of the college with respect to tenure and to procedure in removal seem to the committee unsatisfactory in themselves, and detrimental to the interests of the college, since teachers of the highest type, able to obtain employment elsewhere, are not, as a rule, attracted to the service of institutions in which conditions unsatisfactory in these respects are known to prevail. The rules of tenure, even for full professorships, are ill-defined, and give no adequate assurance that professors will retain their positions during efficiency and good behavior. It would also appear that a teacher of professorial rank has in fact been dismissed without a definite statement of charges or opportunity to confront his accusers, for both of which he had asked; and that no hearing judicial in character was held on the case by the Board of Trustees or its Executive Committee.

With regard to the removal of Mr. J. A. Rice from his professorship, the committee finds in the case nothing seriously reflecting upon either the private character or the scholarship of Mr. Rice, or upon his ability as a teacher. The committee has gathered from its conversations with President Holt that the principal reason for the action taken by him was his conviction that certain utterances and acts of Mr. Rice had given so much offense to others, and had so disturbed the harmony of the college community, that the possibility of his further usefulness in Rollins College had ended. Concerning the adequacy of the reasons given by the president for his action in removing Mr. Rice, and the correctness of the statements of other persons presented in substantiation of these reasons, the committee's collection and analysis of evidence is not complete. It is therefore not prepared at the present time to state any conclusions on these questions.

ARTHUR O. LOVEJOY, *Chairman*  
AUSTIN S. EDWARDS.



## CENTRE COLLEGE, COMMITTEE A STATEMENT

On March 21, 1933, the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees of Centre College, acting for the entire Board, voted to discontinue the Department of Journalism and Public Speaking, and to terminate the services of Boyd A. Wise, the professor in charge, on September 1, 1933. This action was taken on exceedingly brief consideration. Professor Wise was not consulted in advance although he was then in his twelfth year of service to the College. Neither were the faculty consulted at any time. President Charles J. Turck urged that the discontinuance of the Department be postponed to September, 1934, and voted against the resolution to dismiss. It should be added that Professor Wise was later given a hearing, but the decision remained unchanged. The disquieting nature of this incident, and particularly the summary and improper procedure, caused the Association to request Professor H. Gordon Hayes, Department of Economics, The Ohio State University, to make a visit of inquiry. Professor Hayes interviewed representatives of the administration, the faculty, and the student body. His report on file at the Association's Washington office summarizes the evidence and states the following conclusions:

- (1) That no question is raised as to Professor Wise's scholarship, ability as a teacher, or character.
- (2) That while economy was a factor in the action taken, there was also involved a serious conflict of personalities.
- (3) That while the President urged postponement until September, 1934, and voted as indicated above, he is liable to severe censure for not insisting upon delay until Professor Wise and the faculty could be consulted, and for accepting the ruling of the Board without public protest.
- (4) That in this case, and apparently in others brought to the attention of the investigator, the Board of Trustees has improperly interfered in purely educational matters, and that if educational policy is to be dictated in this fashion, the tenure of faculty members is on precarious ground.

## EDUCATIONAL DISCUSSION

### REPORT OF COMMITTEE U ON COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY TEACHING<sup>1</sup>

...A most auspicious report on college and university teaching has recently been issued by the American Association of University Professors. This report states at the very outset:

"The purpose of college teaching is to induce self-propelled intellectual activity on the part of the student. Accordingly a frank recognition of this principle of self-education under guidance will suggest a sufficient definition of good teaching. To teach effectively is to lead, to inspire, and to guide the learner. Any technique or device that serves these ends is a good device.

"Hence the most important question to ask about the teacher is: Does he interest and inspire his students to the extent of getting them to work hard for themselves? In order to attain this end a great variety of techniques are equally available from which the teacher may choose. In any discussion of the methods whereby college teaching can be improved it is imperative that the end, as well as the means, be kept to the forefront. No additional method or device can be of real service to the teacher unless its use induces the student to do better work on his own account. This ought to be axiomatic but in educational discussions it is sometimes overlooked. The end is lost to view in controversies over technique and methods. In achieving this end, moreover, the general spirit and temper of an educational institution is of the highest importance as a means of reinforcing the instruction."

This report is based upon a study of educational practice in educational institutions in all sections of the country. The report is a generalization and appraisal of this practice and an attempt to discuss the practical philosophy of college teaching, its relationship to research, the types of criteria that may be applied to it, the teacher's responsibility for self-improvement and for the educational policies of the institution that he represents, the effect of non-teaching activities upon teaching, the sectioning of classes on the basis of ability or achievement, use of comprehensive examinations, and other devices intended to help teaching.

The committee in charge of this report is of the opinion that much can be accomplished for the promotion of better teaching if college administrators will encourage departments to make a self-study of their own work. The committee also manifests deep interest in new methods of instruction that are being advocated in college circles generally and

<sup>1</sup> Address before the Institute for Administrative Officers of Higher Institutions, University of Chicago, July, 1933, reprinted in *Needed Readjustments in Higher Education*, W. S. Gray, Editor, University of Chicago Press.

NOTE: An article "The Improvement of College Teaching," by E. H. Wilkins, in *The Educational Record*, vol. xiv. No. 4, also discusses the report of the Committee on College and University Teaching.

suggests that a subcommittee on the improvement of instruction might very well undertake an analysis and appraisal of these methods. Especially is the committee interested in those methods of instruction which throw more of the responsibility for his education upon the student himself. It is a fact that during the last two decades emphasis in college teaching has been moving steadily toward greater individualizing of instruction; that is, more and more responsibility has been placed upon the individual student. The new devices such as independent study courses, honors courses, preceptorial and tutorial systems, conference plans, free periods for reading and the like—all emphasize this tendency. All these had their origin in a belief that the regular routine of classroom work does not provide a sufficient challenge for the best students and that even for students of lesser ability there should be some adaptation of college work to their individual needs and abilities.

The committee still further urges that experimentation with teaching processes be encouraged and that it be carried on under such controlled conditions as will permit of a careful examination of the experiments themselves. This report, as I have already said, is the most significant document that has been issued on the subject of college teaching in recent years. It is a scholarly, unprejudiced, disinterested attempt at an analysis of the forces and factors affecting college teaching and clearly recognizes, without admitting that college teaching today is poor, that some improvement is both necessary and possible.

LOTUS D. COFFMAN

#### SOME ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS GOVERNING THE APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTION OF COLLEGE TEACHERS

An interesting statistical analysis is based on a questionnaire sent 1077 presidents of colleges, 688 of whom returned usable replies. Four hundred and thirty-four were from presidents of liberal arts colleges, constituting 66% of all presidents of this type of institution. These are subdivided into university colleges and separate colleges.

Table I shows the extent to which higher degrees, masters and doctors, are and should be required for appointment. The figures for the university colleges are for the doctorate, present requirement 34%, desirable requirement 65%. For the separate colleges 15% and 38%, respectively. There is a definite trend toward raising the minimum requirement for appointment from the master's to the doctor's degree; for the separate colleges, 15% and 38%, respectively. Other data indicate that in a number of instances where higher degrees are not required for appointment, they are made prerequisite for promotion. These requirements have created a serious problem of enrolment in graduate schools, in-

creasing from 15,612 in 1920 to 47,255 in 1930. Of the number of degrees of doctor of philosophy awarded in 1930, 2024 represented an increase of 280% over the 532 awarded in 1920.

Many of the graduate school heads have censured the college presidents for creating a great part of the graduate school enrolment problem by what they term an unnecessary insistence upon higher degrees, particularly the doctorate, as prerequisites for appointment and promotion. However, it is important to recall that the insistence of college presidents upon higher degrees as prerequisites for appointment and promotion is due largely to the influence of the graduate schools themselves. Graduate schools, through their domination of standards of accreditation, have either forced or led college administrators to believe that they must staff their faculties with persons who have had certain amounts of graduate training—two years in the case of members of professorial rank, and the equivalent of the doctorate for department heads. Moreover, because of the fact that a large number of presidents have found it difficult to establish the equivalent of the doctorate, they have required the degree itself.

Table II analyzes the extent to which research or productivity is required as a prerequisite for promotion. It is especially significant to note that the requirement of participation in research or "productivity" is considered much more desirable than the present practise indicates. It is obvious that, if desirable practise is a valid criterion of the probable trend of actual practise, the requirement of participation in research or "productivity" will obtain in from one-third to over one-half of the colleges in the immediate future.

It should be observed, in view of the fact that actual practise is much wider than present requirements indicate and in view of the definite trend toward an increase in these requirements, that the recommendations of the Association of American Colleges that emphasis upon research in the preparation of college teachers be diminished is apparently in the wrong direction.

Table III indicates the extent to which courses in education and teaching experience are or should be required as a prerequisite for the appointment of college teachers, while only 34% of all the colleges indicate that courses in education are actually required, yet 80% indicate the desirability of such a requirement. Four general types are considered desirable:

- (a) Methods of teaching one's special subject.
- (b) Practise teaching under strict supervision.
- (c) A course on the American college.
- (d) Courses dealing with the psychology of learning.

Of the university colleges, only 3% now require courses in education while 32% think them desirable. Only a negligible number of presidents indicate that such a requirement is actually made or is desirable in respect to promotion. The data show an unmistakable trend toward the requirement of teaching experience. It would appear that the demand for teachers with experience will evidently have to be met by practice teaching or some similar type of training.

Condensed from an article in *School and Society*, vol. xxxviii, No. 976, by C. H. THOMPSON.

#### A PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

... It is probable that segregations of classes on the basis of ability will not be so popular as was once the case with us. The intellectual advantages have not proved to be so large as we had expected and the unsatisfactory emotional consequences have been far greater than we had anticipated. Probably a school class should be a society as mixed as cooperating groups are in life generally. Leadership and followership alternate in every group, and they are alternate rôles in every personal life, shifting with the situations, problems, and persons present. Careful observation of the way in which the world actually carries on in a democratic society confirms the policy and it may well be adopted by schools as a way to give persons with different qualities a chance to practice the skills of leadership and the appreciations of followership. At any rate the world seems to be in need of just this sort of social education....

Hereafter the teacher's human interest, sympathy, and understanding will be just as important a part of his equipment as his academic and technical training, and probably more fundamental. In the best modern and democratic sense the new type teacher must be a thoroughgoing humanist regardless of his special field of scholarship. He will not be so much a teacher of subjects as a moulder of men and women. He will need to be a civilized person if he is to bring all the resources of civilization to bear upon youth, which is to say he will be liberally educated.

There are too many academic specialists in our public schools who know very much about a little field of study and nothing much about the wide ranges which make up the rest of life. And unfortunately they have been given preferment in appointment, promotion, and remuneration. And with what result? Steadily through the years departmentalized teaching has been introduced further and further down and it has not been particularly good for the child to be treated in uncorrelated bits. Effective humanization of a child requires that every teacher that



influences him have regard for his whole personality. In no other way can education fully humanize. . . .

I am fearful of certain conspicuous trends among the teacher training group of professional educators. Of all educators they should have fewer of the diseases of academic scholars and more of the virtues of humanized teachers. But just now they are advocating more pay and more promotion for mere training of the type we do not most need. Just now they are playing into the hands of the ancient foe—the specialists of the academic life, trying to revamp their curricula so as to make entrance to candidacy for academic degrees easier for their graduates so that their institutions will be not educationally and socially more useful, but academically more respectable. They have so many new problems to solve, and so many new efficiencies to meet, that one wonders how they can afford to be so concerned about something that academicians are growing less concerned about every day. It seems a strange reversal of conditions. Most of all we need the cooperation of the teacher-training profession if the educative process is to be the potent spiritual instrument of American civilization in its program for tomorrow.

HENRY SUZZALLO

*The Educational Record*, vol xiii, No. 2

## REVIEWS

### A CALL TO TEACHERS

*A Call to the Teachers of the Nation*, by the Committee of the Progressive Education Association on Social and Economic Problems; New York; The John Day Company, Inc.; 31 pp.

This compact and forceful pamphlet sketches the movements of American history leading to present conditions, describes the urgent needs in current education, and makes an eloquent plea for more active and fearless leadership among the teachers of the nation.

Something of the trend of the argument is shown in the following quotations:

"In the face of these conditions teachers, the guardians of childhood, the bearers of culture, the avowed servants of the people can not remain silent. To do so would be to violate every trust reposed in them by society. They must speak out and take their stand. This is the more imperative because the present troubles are by no means narrowly economic in character. The current depression is but symptomatic of a profound conflict, caused by the fortunes of history and the struggle of classes, that penetrates to the very roots of our culture. . . .

"In the great battle of ideas and values precipitated by the advance of industrial civilization the teachers of the country are inevitably and intimately involved. They can not stand apart and at the same time discharge their professional obligations. This is due to the fact that they are guardians of childhood, bearers of culture, and, presumably, loyal servants of the masses of the people. These three considerations compel the teachers to action. . . .

"If the teachers are to play a positive and creative rôle in building a better social order, indeed if they are not to march in the ranks of economic, political, and cultural reaction, they will have to emancipate themselves completely from the domination of the business interests of the nation, cease cultivating the manners and associations of bankers and promotion agents, repudiate utterly the ideal of material success as the goal of education, abandon the smug middle-class tradition on which they have been nourished in the past, acquire a realistic understanding of the forces that actually rule the world, and formulate a fundamental program of thought and action that will deal honestly and intelligently with the problems of industrial civilization. . . ."

For guidance in carrying out this more militant participation in national life new procedures in education are sketched, and support of organized efforts to achieve such advances are declared to be one of the major purposes of the Progressive Education Association. A sugges-

tive bibliography is appended. This exceptionally well-written and coherent challenge deserves wide reading among all members of the teaching profession.

#### MEASURING TEACHING EFFICIENCY AMONG COLLEGE INSTRUCTORS

*Measuring Teaching Efficiency among College Instructors*, by George W. Hartmann; New York: Bureau of Publications, Columbia University, 1933; 45 pp.

This monograph provides a brief but useful summary of points of view in a difficult field which has aroused so much recent interest.

Chapter II outlines the various kinds of systematic effort to work out the measurements involved. In summarizing these, the author observes:

"Most of these promising and ambitious investigations are characterized by stupendous industry in collecting mass data and high skill in applying the multiple correlation technique to them—but the findings are generally disappointing. Not so much because the prognostic instruments are faulty; nor because statistical certainty is lowered by operating with a select group rather than with the general population; nor because many of the qualities correlated are truly irrelevant (although all these explanations contribute something); but largely, I believe, because the authorities could not supply a dependable classification of their personnel. Under favorable conditions, the best rating scales constructed by applied psychologists are reasonably consistent and reliable, but in the absence of independent standards of success, their validity remains unknown."

The main section of the study then describes in statistical form, certain experimental tests, three sections of a required sophomore course in educational psychology taught by three different instructors being the subject of the investigation.

The conclusions are stated as follows:

"Can teaching efficiency be measured? If measurement implies a maximum amount of objectivity, the answer of this investigation is an emphatic 'Yes.' How accurately can teaching efficiency be measured? One must pause before giving a reply. A reasonable claim would be that a small number of teachers of the same subject can be fairly precisely arranged in a serial order of merit, but that the exact magnitude of the gap between any two individual positions can be only roughly approximated. Nevertheless, to be able to rank teachers on the basis of objectively ascertainable changes in their pupils by procedures which take account of all educational objectives is eminently worth while. The prediction is not unwarranted that the most promising future methods of

investigating instructional skill will attempt to determine the amount and kind of personality modifications transpiring between initial and final determinations of status when subject to a given variety of human environment. The testing program should undoubtedly be expanded just as surely as the mathematical technique ought to be refined, but the broad outlines of this type of experimental approach ought to be preserved until supplanted by a more direct measuring instrument.

"The shortcomings of this procedure are unfortunately serious. Its chief limitation is the impracticability of employing it on any large scale. The demands upon the time, energy, and skill of a well-trained educational expert are probably more than the ordinary community school system could afford. In addition, the method as illustrated in this account is applicable only to those circumstances where classes consisting of similar pupils are pursuing the same subjects. Where these conditions are met, however, the scheme seems worthy of further trial."

## LOCAL AND CHAPTER NOTES

### INDIANA UNIVERSITY, TWO-YEAR ELECTIVE COURSE

A new two-year course providing relaxed entrance requirements and increased freedom in choice of subjects is announced for this fall. Any graduate of a public or private commissioned high school in the state may enter, regardless of the distribution of his high school subjects. Students of twenty-one years or over who are not high school graduates may be admitted as special students. The new course permits the student to make his choice of subjects. He may pursue a specialized field of study, such as journalism, or he may distribute his work over such fields as literature, art, music, language, and the sciences.

The committee in its official bulletin on the two-year course recommends a broadened curriculum and will so counsel most students, but the student has the final choice. Proficiency in the use of the English language, and military training or physical education for students under twenty-two years will be the only requirements. When a student can demonstrate by examination his correct use of English, no composition courses will be required of him.

Two-year students will work with other students in classrooms and laboratories, with the same teachers and the same requirements as to attendance and quality of work. Successful completion of the two-year course will carry with it a certificate.

Transfer to four-year courses will be provided at any time during the course, with full credit to be granted for work done which can be applied to the other courses selected. Any deficiency on entrance requirements will have to be made up, but this can be accomplished in most cases.

"The less strict entrance requirements," Professor Yeager and his committee explain, "are provided to accommodate those students who may not have planned their high school or their preparatory school training with the expectation of entering one of the established college courses and who, therefore, for this or a similar reason, may not be eligible for matriculation in the other divisions of the university. The greater freedom in the selection of studies is based on the belief that some students who expect to remain in college only one or two years may profit more from a program of studies selected in terms of their own individual desires and needs than by completing the first one or two years of the regular four-year college course."

The new freedom of entrance requirements and selection of courses is in line with similar provisions at the University of Minnesota. The committee pointed out that the two-year course is not intended to replace



in any way or to compete with the regular four-year course leading to a degree. Popularity of the new two-year course is indicated by advance inquiries from 1072 prospective students.

*School and Society*, vol. xxxviii, No. 972

#### MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, STUDENT TUTORS

As a part of the plan to give worthy students every possible opportunity to meet the cost of their education an approved list of student tutors in first and second year courses has been instituted. Under this system any registered students may apply to the dean of students for inclusion in this list. Preference will be given to upper classmen and graduate students. The technical competence of applicants will be passed upon by heads of departments responsible for the subjects in which the students desire to tutor.

In addition to providing financial assistance to deserving students these tutors will have opportunities for gaining valuable experience in methods of teaching.

The plan abolishes paid tutoring in first- and second-year subjects by members of the staff.

A Graduate House for graduate students has been opened at the Institute this fall. Seventy-seven of the 500 graduate students are living in this house. These 77 come from 40 different colleges and universities and include students from four foreign countries. Next year it is planned to increase the accommodations to care for about 200 men.

#### UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, EMERGENCY GRADUATE FELLOWSHIPS

Through the Committee on Salary Contributions, an Emergency Fellowship Fund of \$10,000 has been established for the coming year. The fellowships are to be awarded through the Graduate School to the potentially most productive persons who are worthy and needy falling within the following groups:

1. Persons of superior ability recently graduated from the University of Minnesota with the Ph.D. degree. (Stipends to be \$750 or less.)
2. Promising candidates for the Ph.D. degree who have had at least one year of graduate work at the University of Minnesota. (Stipends \$500 or less, with no exemption from tuition fees.)
3. Other promising candidates for any graduate degree, who are graduates of the University of Minnesota. (Stipends \$250 or less, with no exemption from tuition fees.)

Wherever possible, graduate students should obtain necessary aid from the already established loan fund. In some cases a student may be able to secure a loan to supplement an emergency fellowship. A

small amount of suitable service (preferably in research) will be expected from each appointed fellow.

#### UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH, RESOLUTIONS

At a recent meeting of the Executive Committee of the Pittsburgh Chapter of the American Association of University Professors, it was decided in view of the many favorable replies received from the local chapters to the letter sent out by this chapter to all local chapters under date of March 23, 1933, to ask you to be kind enough to print this letter in the next issue of the *Bulletin*.

Our committee feels that it would be well if this matter were brought again to the attention of all members and chapters of the Association before the Executive Council meets in December.

Yours very truly,

JOHN DAMBACH, *Secretary*,  
Pittsburgh Chapter.

#### UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

March 23, 1933.

To the Officers of Local Chapters.

Dear Sirs:

In transmitting to you the accompanying resolutions the University of Pittsburgh Chapter of the A. A. U. P. wishes to make clear the reasons for its action.

The recent growth of the Association has been remarkable, and the strength of the Association has correspondingly increased. These developments are testimonials to the wise leadership and efficient administration which it has been the good fortune of the Association to possess during the past decade. But it seems to this chapter that these same developments have created conditions which require a reorganization of the Association's administrative machinery.

Certain weaknesses in the present organization of the Association are clearly evident. There is a lack of cohesion among the local chapters, many of which are moribund. The present means of gathering and expressing chapter opinion are ineffectual. The national Council does not represent the chapters, and its rôle in the administration and association is somewhat perfunctory. It is little more than a body which sanctions decisions made either by the Executive Committee, the General Secretary, or by the President. Its membership is determined by no particular rule. The delegate meetings are only gestures of representation. The delegates have almost no knowledge of the activities of the Association as carried on by the officers, Council, and numerous committees. The presentation of an issue by a delegate often takes the form of a controversy between the central administration and the chapter which the delegate represents. As matters now stand, it appears to this chapter that the life of the Association runs in a tiny group of

officers at the heart of the organization, and a small and indefinite number of chapters which spasmodically become agitated about some matter seemingly significant for the administration or policy of the Association.

The accompanying recommendations look toward the reorganization of the administration of the Association so that the situation described in the preceding paragraph may be reformed, and the University of Pittsburgh Chapter seeks the cooperation of the other local chapters in furthering their adoption. It suggests that the recommendations be discussed by the several chapters, which in turn will indicate to the national Council their approval or disapproval, or alternative proposals.

Very truly yours,

M. R. GABBERT, *President*,  
University of Pittsburgh  
Chapter.

*Recommendation for The Reorganization of The Central Administration  
of the A. A. U. P.*

Whereas the administration of the central office of the A. A. U. P. and the general policy of the Association are now being subjected to investigation and consideration by special committees appointed by the president, it appears to this chapter that this is a proper time for recommending the adoption of certain measures of reorganization. It is therefore resolved:

1. That, to secure more intimate contacts between the local chapters of the A. A. U. P. and its national officers, this chapter recommends the reorganization of the central administration so that one of its members may serve as a traveling secretary.

2. That, to secure a more democratic choice of Council members and to further the coherence of neighboring chapters, we recommend the grouping of the chapters in suitable geographic districts, each of which will choose its own Council member.

## COMMUNICATIONS

### FROM A UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT

"The only thing that was disappointing with regard to your [appointment] service was the fact that all of those whose names we received had already been placed and weren't interested in the position we had to offer, which I realize called for a lot of experience as well as wide training at a very small salary. From our own experience with our Board of Recommendations I know that it is impossible for a service to expect to be notified when those who are enrolled with them are placed in a new job."

### FROM A JUNIOR MEMBER

"With sincere regrets for delay in paying my dues. Was away for several months and failed to note my deferred obligations. My belief is that if we ever needed the A.A.U.P. it is now."

## NOMINATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP

The following fifty-two nominations for active membership and seven nominations for junior membership are printed as provided under Article IV of the Constitution. Objection to any nominee may be addressed to the General Secretary, 744 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C., or to the Chairman of the Committee on Admissions<sup>1</sup> and will be considered by the Committee if received before December 25, 1933.

The Committee on Admissions consists of R. E. Dengler, Pennsylvania State, Chairman; A. L. Bouton, New York; H. L. Crosby, Pennsylvania; A. C. Lane, Tufts; A. O. Lovejoy, Johns Hopkins; W. T. Magruder, Ohio State; Julian Park, Buffalo.

Elisabeth Amen (Psychology), Wheaton  
David L. Arm (Mechanical Engineering), Lafayette  
Agnes Berrigan (English), Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical  
Mary F. Boyd (French, Spanish), Drake  
H. B. Brown (Agronomy), Louisiana State  
Monroe S. Carroll (Accounting), Baylor (Waco)  
James D. Coronios (Psychology), Brown  
Dorothy R. Davies (Physical Education), Washington (St. Louis)  
Howard E. Egan (History), De Paul  
Hilbert A. Fisher (Mathematics), North Carolina State  
Donald E. H. Frear (Animal Nutrition), Pennsylvania State  
Elsie E. Gulley (History), Wheaton  
Albert F. Henning (Journalism), Southern Methodist  
Arthur J. M. Johnson (Physics), Montana State  
James A. Kiefer (Physics), Montana State  
Frank J. McClure (Agricultural Biochemistry), Pennsylvania State  
George McCracken (Greek, German), Grove City  
Robert B. MacLeod (Psychology), Swarthmore  
Albert G. Mallison (History), Southwestern Louisiana  
Charles M. Merrick (Mechanical Engineering), Lafayette  
Russell C. Miller (Animal Nutrition), Pennsylvania State  
W. D. Morris (Electrical Engineering), Louisiana State  
J. A. Nelson (Dairy Industry), Montana State  
Roland R. Renne (Economics), Montana State  
Edward O. Salant (Physics), New York  
Mattie Sanders (Primary), Arkansas State Teachers (Conway)  
Theodore Schreiber (German), Alma  
Grace Shepard (English), Wheaton  
V. E. Stansbury (Education), Morningside  
Mamie Tanquist (Anthropology), New Mexico  
Howard M. Waddle (Chemistry), Georgia School of Technology  
Philip Wheelwright (Philosophy), New York  
Alma E. White (Household Science), Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical  
Robert C. White (English), Tufts  
James W. Woodard (Sociology), Temple

<sup>1</sup> Nominations should in all cases be presented through the Washington Office, 744 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.



## NOMINATIONS FOR JUNIOR MEMBERSHIP

Blanchard S. Gummo (Art), Bucknell  
Ira B. Hansen (Biology), Union  
R. W. Hidy (History), Wheaton

## SUPPLEMENTARY LIST OF NOMINATIONS FOR ACTIVE MEMBERSHIP

William P. Briggs (Pharmacy), George Washington  
Harold G. Carlson (German), Wells  
W. Elmer Ekblaw (Geography), Clark  
John W. Harrelson (Mathematics), North Carolina State  
Reginald W. Harris (Paleontology), Oklahoma  
Arthur H. Hughes (German), George Washington  
Bruce J. Miller (Chemistry), Bucknell  
H. Elwood Morris (Plant Pathology), Montana State  
Harvey E. Murdock (Agricultural Engineering), Montana State  
Kenneth Redman (Pharmacy), North Dakota Agricultural  
Henry G. Roberts (Public Speaking), George Washington  
John W. Stovall (Geology), Oklahoma  
A. L. Strand (Entomology), Montana State  
William D. Taelman (Mathematics), Montana State  
Samuel Van Valkenburg (Geography), Clark  
Karl R. Wallace (Public Speaking), Iowa State  
Paul A. Young (Botany), Montana State

## SUPPLEMENTARY LIST OF NOMINATIONS FOR JUNIOR MEMBERSHIP

George J. Goodman (Botany), Oklahoma  
Margaret E. Hall (German), Georgia State Woman's  
John Heldman, Jr. (Physical Education), Connecticut State  
Elmer K. Kilmer (Education), Seton Hall

## Appointment Service Announcements

The Appointment Service is open only to members but formal registration is necessary.

Those interested in keyed vacancies may have duplicates of their registration blanks transmitted to appointing officers on request.

Members registered with the Appointment Service may have brief announcements inserted in the Teachers Available section at a charge of \$1.00 per line for the first insertion and 50 per cent of that amount for repetitions. Copy should reach the Washington Office not later than the end of the month preceding publication.

Administrative officers who are interested in announcements under Teachers Available may, upon inquiry, receive copies of registration papers of candidates. Appointing officers are invited to report vacancies at their institutions.

## Vacancy Reported

French: Man, Ph.D. in French necessary. Some teaching experience also in German. V 588

## Teachers Available

Biology, Bacteriology, Physiology, Parasitology: Young woman, M.A. Five years' graduate work at Chicago. Six years of successful college teaching. Extensive travel. Desires transfer. A 710

History: Man, 27, Ph.D. California. Experience. Available 1934. A 711

Italian: Graduate Italian university; French; Spanish. A 712

Psychology: Ph.D. Columbia; 26. Three years' university teaching; publications; foreign travel; Sigma Xi. Major interest social and abnormal. Available February or September. A 713

Spanish, French, Italian: Ph.D., linguist, American. Sixteen years' teaching; travel; philological writings. University preferred, 1934-35. A 714

Statistics: Teaching experience; trained in research. A 715